




GRACE JOURNAL

A PUBLICATION OF GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Winona Lake, Indiana

WINTER 1963

Vol. 4

No. 1



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
LYRASIS members and Sloan Foundation

<http://www.archive.org/details/gracejournal1963413kent>

GRACE JOURNAL

A publication of Grace Theological Seminary

VOLUME 4

WINTER, 1963

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

BIBLICAL INERRANCY AND THE DOUBLE- REVELATION THEORY	John C. Whitcomb, Jr.	3
THE PROBLEM OF THE EFFICACY OF OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICES	Hobart E. Freeman	21
THE PATRIARCHS' KNOWLEDGE OF JEHOVAH	John J. Davis	29
GENERAL REVIEW	Herman A. Hoyt	44
BOOK REVIEWS		47

GRACE JOURNAL is published three times each year (Winter, Spring, Fall) by Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana.

EDITORIAL POLICY: The editors of GRACE JOURNAL hold the historic Christian faith, and accept without reservation the inerrancy of Scripture and the premillennial view of eschatology. A more complete expression of their theological position may be found in the Statement of Faith of Grace Theological Seminary. The editors, however, do not necessarily endorse every opinion that may be expressed by individual writers in the JOURNAL.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.00 per calendar year; single copy, 75c.

ADDRESS: All subscriptions and review copies of books should be sent to GRACE JOURNAL, Box 397, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Copyright, 1963, by Grace Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Editor

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.
Managing Editor

HERMAN A. HOYT
General Review Editor

S. HERBERT BESS
Book Review Editor

HOBART E. FREEMAN
Manuscript Editor

JAMES L. BOYER
E. WILLIAM MALE
KENNETH G. MOELLER
Business Committee

ALVA J. McCLAIN
HOMER A. KENT, SR.
JOHN REA
Consulting Editors

BIBLICAL INERRANCY AND THE DOUBLE-REVELATION THEORY

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.

Professor of Old Testament
Grace Theological Seminary

Judging from the number of recent controversies in evangelical circles concerning the full implications of the doctrine that the Bible is divinely and verbally inspired and thus inerrant in the autographs, there seems to be little likelihood that Christians who hold to this crucially important teaching of Scripture are about to enter upon a period of triumphant and undisturbed peace and acceptance in the Protestant world.

For example, it has recently been asserted that the very possibility of a verbally inerrant revelation has been rendered untenable by studies in the field of linguistics.¹ Others are claiming that the Bible contains historical errors which can be explained on the basis of inspired and therefore accurate quotations from non-inspired and erroneous sources.² Along with this comes the suggestion that verbal inspiration extends only to those "basic" matters which God intended to convey to man, and not to mere "peripheral" matters.³ We are also being told that a true understanding of the nature of Biblical inspiration must be attained through an inductive study of the actual phenomena of Scripture rather than by a deduction from Biblical proof-texts on inspiration.⁴ Thus, many evangelical Christians have been led to believe that verbal inspiration is merely a human theory about the Bible, and therefore is neither essential to true Christianity nor legitimate as a standard and test of orthodoxy.⁵

The fact that such viewpoints have been publicized recently by scholars who claim to be evangelical should be profoundly disturbing to those who accept by faith the Bible's clear testimony to its own verbal inerrancy (cf. Prov. 30:5-6; II Tim. 3:16; II Pet. 1:19-21; John 10:34; Matt. 5:18). Nevertheless, it is not our purpose in this paper to deal with any of the above-mentioned views, for we believe that they have already been adequately refuted by competent evangelical theologians.⁶ Instead, it is our purpose to examine yet another theory that has gained wide acceptance among evangelical Christians and that tends to undermine the Biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration. For lack of a better term, we have chosen to call this "The Double-Revelation Theory." In the following pages we shall present some recent expressions of this view, expose some of its basic fallacies, and then draw our conclusions with regard to this view in the light of the Biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration.

This paper is an expanded revision of a presidential address given at the Seventh General Meeting of the Midwestern Section of the Evangelical Theological Society, May 4, 1962, at Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois.

THE DOUBLE-REVELATION THEORY

Briefly stated, this theory maintains that God has given to man two revelations of truth, each of which is fully authoritative in its own realm: the revelation of God in Scripture and the revelation of God in nature. Although these two revelations differ greatly in their character and scope, they cannot contradict each other, since they are given by the same self-consistent God of truth. The theologian is the God-appointed interpreter of Scripture, and the scientist is the God-appointed interpreter of nature, and each has specialized tools for determining the true meaning of the particular book of revelation which he is called upon to study. Whenever there is apparent conflict between the conclusions of the scientist and the conclusions of the theologian, especially with regard to such problems as the origin of the universe, the solar system, the earth, animal life, and man; the effects of the Edenic curse; and the magnitude and effects of the Noahic Deluge, the theologian must rethink his interpretation of the Scriptures at these points in such a way as to bring the Bible into harmony with the general consensus of scientific opinion, since the Bible is not a textbook on science, and these problems overlap the territory in which science alone must give us the detailed and authoritative answers.

The double-revelation theory holds that this is necessarily the case, because if an historical and grammatical interpretation of the Biblical account of Creation, the Edenic curse, and the Flood should lead the Bible student to adopt conclusions that are contrary to the prevailing views of trained scientists concerning the origin and history of the earth, then he would be guilty of making God a deceiver of mankind in these vitally important matters. But a God of truth cannot lie. Therefore, Genesis must be interpreted in such a way as to agree with the generally-accepted views of modern science. After all, Genesis was written primarily to give us answers to the questions, "Who?" and "Why?" Modern science, however, must answer the important questions, "When?" and "How?"⁷

BASIC FALLACIES OF THIS THEORY

I. It Underestimates the Limitations of the Scientific Method

In the first place, the double-revelation theory fails to give due recognition to the tremendous limitations which inhibit the scientific method when applied to the study of origins. In the very nature of the case, the scientific method (which analyzes the laws of nature in repeatable events) is incapable of processing the miraculous and the supernatural, the once-for-all and the utterly unique, the spiritual and the unseen. The scientific method assumes without proof the universal validity of uniformity as a law of nature, by extrapolating present processes forever into the past and future; and it ignores the possible anti-theistic bias of the scientist himself as he handles the "facts" of nature in arriving at a cosmology (a theory concerning the basic structure and character of the universe) and a cosmogony (a theory concerning the origin of the universe and its parts). To the extent that the double-revelation theory fails to give careful and honest recognition to these essential limitations of the scientific method it will fail to give a true and undistorted picture of reality as a whole, and it will fail also to point men to the true source for understanding its mysteries.

II. It Underestimates the Failures of Uniformitarian Science

In the second place, the double-revelation theory overlooks the insuperable scientific problems which continue to plague all uniformitarian and evolutionary theories concerning the origin of the material universe and of living things. Many Christians are familiar with the scientific obstacles which the theory of total organic evolution must surmount, such as the transition from non-life to life, the debilitating and even lethal effects of the vast majority of mutations, the large and as yet unbridged gaps between animal forms in the fossil record, and the clear evidence of global catastrophes, rather than gradual uniform processes, in the formation of the fossil strata.⁸

Not so familiar to Christians, perhaps, are the insuperable difficulties which continue to beset cosmogonists who insist upon explaining the origin of the solar system in terms of naturalistic processes. The famous nebular hypothesis of Immanuel Kant (1755) and Pierre Simon de Laplace (1796) pictured a very hot, rotating disk of gas from which planets were formed when gaseous rings were detached by centrifugal force from the main body of the Sun during the early stages of its contraction. But this theory was abandoned by the end of the 19th century when it was shown that such gaseous rings could never condense into planets and that they could not have retained 98% of the angular momentum of the solar system (which is true of the major planets today). But the various encounter or planetesimal theories, which postulated the near approach of another star to our sun, resulting in eruptions of planetary bits (Chamberlin and Moulton - 1905); or the drawing off of a cigar-shaped filament of material that eventually broke up into a string of separate masses (Sir James Jeans), or the actual collision of our sun with a star that resulted in the formation of planets (Harold Jeffreys - 1929); or the collision of a star with an original companion star of the Sun, causing a ribbon of material to be dragged out between them (R. A. Lyttleton - 1936), were all discarded as hopelessly inadequate explanations of the solar system by the year 1940.⁹ Beginning in 1944, Von Weizsacker, Whipple, Spitzer, Urey, Gamow, Hoyle, and others have attempted to avoid the difficulties of the planetesimal theories by returning to a form of nebular hypothesis, whereby the Sun and its planets condensed out of swirling eddies of cold, dark, interstellar clouds of gas and dust. How well this currently popular theory succeeds in explaining the solar system in terms of physical, chemical, and mathematical principles alone may be judged by the reader for himself after considering carefully some of the problems which continue to harass the cosmogonist.

(1) The Problem of the Condensation of the Sun and its Planets from a Cold Nebula of Gas and Dust.

Gerald P. Kuiper, a noted American astronomer, seeks to explain the evolution of the solar system in the following manner:

What made the gas of the future sun begin to condense was presumably a chance eddy that brought together enough atoms in one region so that their total gravity overcame the momentum of the individual movements and held them together in a single, collapsing cloud. Very slowly the matter of the cloud began to fall inward on eddies where the gas was densest. By far the largest of the eddies was the protosun. Its overwhelming gravitational influence shaped the rest of the cloud into a huge, rotating disk...The lesser eddies, rolling lazily around on one another like ball bearings, were the protoplanets...The surface of the sun turned slowly red and hot, orange and hotter, yellow and incandescent.

Its first red rays, falling on the half-begotten protoplanets, began to drive away the smoke of matter in which they had been born and on which they were still feeding and growing. Soon the protoplanets were no longer rolling around on one another like ball bearings but flying as separately as bees around a newly opened flower.¹⁰

Kuiper's theory, only briefly summarized here, is a refinement of Von Weizsacker's original dust-cloud theory (1944) and the light-pressure theory of Whipple and Spitzer (1948). Although its adherents claim that it avoids the major difficulties of earlier hypotheses, it falls hopelessly far short of explaining scientifically the origin of the solar system.

In the first place, before any condensation of gas and dust could occur, the nebula would have diffused into outer space. Kuiper himself also admits that before gravitational attraction would become significant, the particles would have to be as big as the Moon!¹¹ The theory assumes that dust particles will stick together when they collide; but this does not seem to be the case in dust storms or in any other known situation. Whipple admits that the chief difficulty is to explain how the protoplanets maintained themselves during the early stages when the dust clouds were more rare than the vacuum of a thermos bottle. Yet they had to hold together sufficiently to pick up material from the rare spaces between them, and they had to be massive enough to grow and not spiral in toward the Sun.¹²

In the second place, the theory of "roller bearing" eddies of gas and dust is impossible, because a regular system of vortices must remain intact during essentially the entire period of planetary accretion. This is due to the fact that the planets all revolve around the Sun in the same direction. Kuiper frankly confesses: "It is difficult to conceive that the beautiful system of vortices could actually have been in existence long enough -- even for 10 or 100 years -- to get the condensation of the building material for the planets under way." Yet the theory demands millions of years!¹³

In the third place, even if we assume that this cloud somehow started to condense and that enough condensed to form the Sun, the question arises as to "what stopped the process from continuing so that the entire mass of material did not form one large body? After all, the sun makes up 99 and 6/7% of the mass of the sun and planets combined. Why did that paltry 1/7 of one per cent not fall into the main body also? This is a serious question, and one that has not been answered."¹⁴

Finally, as Paul A. Zimmerman points out, other suns do not seem to be developing planetary systems:

Weizsacker himself recently admitted that the existence of so much interstellar material in the vicinity of our sun, together with the fact that he can find no evidence whatever of stars being formed now from that material, constitutes a paradox. He hazards a guess that the presence of stars already formed prevents the condensation of any more of the interstellar gas. But this is a poor defense. Greenstein, astronomer at the Mount Wilson Observatory, is of the opinion that the known stars rotate so fast that one must conclude that they could never have been formed by a condensation process.¹⁵

As if to put the coup de grace on the validity of this theory of the origin of the solar system, which he himself feels is the best available at the present time, Kuiper states: "It is not a foregone conclusion...that the problem has a scientific solution. For instance, an enclosure in which the air has been stirred gives, after some delay, no clue on the nature or the time of the stirring. All memory of the event within the system has been lost."¹⁶ Kuiper's modesty at this point is indeed commendable, for it is not often seen in the writings of evolutionary cosmogonists. However, a similar sentiment has been expressed by Harold C. Urey: "None of us was there at the time, and any suggestions I may make can hardly be considered as certainly true. The most that can be done is to outline a possible course of events which does not contradict physical laws and observed facts. For the present we cannot deduce by rigorous mathematical methods the exact history that began with a globule of dust."¹⁷ Zimmerman's comment on Urey's statement is well worth pondering:

This shows clearly what cosmogonical theorizing is. It is good, clean fun for an astronomer, a mathematician, a chemist, a physicist. It is an exercise in working out a logical scheme of proposed events which would lead to the formation of the earth and the solar system as we find them now. It is a game, the rules of which are observed physical and chemical laws. But even if one wins the game by devising a perfect system that accounts for every detail of the properties of the heavenly bodies, he still will not have proved that things did, in fact, take place as he deduced they might have.¹⁸

(2) The Problem of the Sun's Small Angular Momentum.

Can evolutionary theory explain the origin of the Sun? Apart from the basic question of the origin of the atomic particles and their stupendous energy (which will be discussed later), one is faced immediately with the vexing problem of the Sun's small angular momentum. David Layzer, Professor of Astronomy at Harvard University, explains that the present rates of rotation of galaxies "can be either measured or inferred from the observed shapes with fair accuracy," and, therefore, "one can calculate how much angular momentum the material in a typical star would have had if it had been part of a gaseous protogalaxy." Layzer continues:

This turns out to be about 10^9 times as much as it now possesses, which means that in the process of contraction a typical protostar would have expended all but 1/10,000,000 of 1% of its original angular momentum. How has this been accomplished? Mass ejection could rid a system of some of its angular momentum, but not of 99.9999999% of it. Magnetic braking has frequently been suggested for the same purpose, but the suggestion has not yet been put in a definite form. At present no satisfactory solution for the difficulty is known.¹⁹

(3) The Problem of the Angular Momentum of the Planets.

In the recently-published Life Nature Library volume entitled, The Universe, the enormous problem which evolution faces at this point is candidly recognized:

One key problem that plagues the builders of model solar systems is the fact that the sun, with over 99 per cent of all the system's matter in its possession, has a mere 2 per cent of the system's angular momentum -- the property that keeps the sun rotating and keeps the

planets revolving around it. The lightweight planets, in consequence, contain under one per cent of the system's matter, but a staggering 98 per cent of its angular momentum. A theory of evolution that fails to account for this peculiar fact is ruled out before it starts.²⁰

It was primarily this problem of the disproportion of angular momentum in the planets as compared to the Sun that finally destroyed the old nebular hypothesis of Kant and Laplace, and the various collision and near-collision theories of Chamberlin, Moulton, Jeans, Jeffreys, and Lyttleton. Has the currently popular cold-nebula hypothesis succeeded where others have failed? Gerald Kuiper has tentatively suggested the "admittedly very speculative" idea that gases between the protoplanets and the sun became ionized during their evaporation "and in this electrical state they acted as a bridge for the Sun's magnetic energy. In effect, they acted as elastic spokes between the Sun's whirling hub and its rims of evaporating protoplanets."²¹

But in refutation of this idea, Professor Layzer of Harvard emphasizes that any form of nebular hypothesis "demands the existence of some highly efficient mechanism for transferring angular momentum from the central part of the nebula to the periphery. Magnetic coupling has been suggested as the mechanism, but no one has yet shown that magnetic fields of the required kind exist and could be expected to occur in a nebula." Furthermore, "the division of angular momentum between Sun and planets must have been even more one-sided than it is now before the planets lost their light gases. The classic difficulty posed by such a division is that of understanding how it could have arisen if all the matter in the solar system had once belonged to a single nebula."²²

(4) The Problem of Eccentric and Inclined Orbits.

Another rather serious problem for evolution is the marked deviation of smaller bodies in the solar system from the "normal" type of orbit demanded by the theory that the system began as a huge, rotating, flattened disk of gas and dust that condensed into a central sun and various protoplanets.²³ Now it is true that the planets reveal three types of regularity in their revolution around the Sun, and it is these regularities that have encouraged evolutionary explanations for the origin of the solar system: (1) all nine planets move around the Sun in the same direction, that is, counterclockwise when viewed from the North Star; (2) all nine planets have nearly circular orbits; (3) the orbits of these nine planets lie in almost the same plane, which is approximately the plane of the Sun's equator.

However, as Professor Layzer points out, cosmogonical theorists tend to emphasize these three regularities while "less emphasis has been laid on the departures from these regularities exhibited by the smaller bodies of the solar system. Of the planets, Mercury (the smallest) and Pluto (the outermost) have the most eccentric and highly inclined orbits [with inclinations of 7 degrees and 17 degrees respectively, and eccentricities of 24% and 20% respectively]. The asteroids, which are probably planetary fragments, have still higher eccentricities and inclinations, while the orbits of comets and meteors show no trace whatever of the three regularities."²⁴

An interesting illustration of the reluctance of evolutionists to face up to the true significance of such deviations from the "normal" pattern may be seen in the following statement by Isaac Asimov:

The general regularity of this picture naturally suggested that some single process had created the whole system. Of course, the irregularities have always been hard to explain away, but there are only a few of them and they may be accounted for as results of

accidents...The fact that Pluto's orbit is tilted well out of the general plane and is somewhat elongated may be explainable on the theory that Pluto was originally a satellite of Neptune and was thrown away from that planet by some cosmic collision or other accident.²⁵

(5) The Problem of the Retrograde Rotation of Uranus.

It is unfortunate for the theory of evolution that the so-called "regularities" of the solar system total no more than three; for of the six planets whose rotations have been well determined, five rotate in the same sense of direction as that of their orbital motion around the Sun, while one, Uranus, rotates in the opposite direction! To be more specific, the axes of the planets with direct (rather than retrograde) rotation deviate from the perpendicular by between 3 degrees and 29 degrees (the earth's axis is tilted 23 1/2 degrees), but the axis of Uranus deviates by 98 degrees, which is eight degrees backwards from the direction of its orbit around the Sun! At the same time, the orbit of Uranus inclines less than that of any other planet. Professor Layzer admits that "it is an open question whether this state of affairs is consistent" with current theories of the origin of the solar system.²⁶ Similarly, W. M. Smart, Professor of Astronomy at the University of Glasgow, concludes: "It must be confessed that it is difficult to account for the exceptional circumstances relating to Uranus if we regard, as indeed we do, the uniformities of orbital and rotational motion in general as providing an incontrovertible argument in favour of the common origin of the planetary system."²⁷

(6) The Problem of Retrograde Satellites.

Six of the nine planets have moons or satellites of their own -- the earth having one, Mars two, Jupiter twelve, Saturn nine, Uranus five, and Neptune two, for a total of thirty-one. As astronomers began to study these planetary satellites, they were astonished to discover that not all of them orbit their planets in the same direction! That is, some of them have retrograde orbits in relation to the rotational direction of their mother planets. This is true of the outer four of Jupiter's twelve satellites; of Phoebe, the outermost of Saturn's nine; of the five moons of Uranus, which move in the equatorial plane of a planet that is tilted 98 degrees from the plane of its own orbit; and of Triton, the inner of Neptune's two satellites, which has nearly twice the mass of our moon (its diameter being 3,000 miles) and which revolves every six days in a nearly circular orbit only 220,000 miles from its mother planet (20,000 miles closer than the Moon to the earth).

Isaac Asimov, as well as many other evolutionary cosmogonists, believes that Triton, like Pluto, "was thrown away from that planet by some cosmic collision or other accident," and that later on Neptune re-captured its lost moon into a retrograde orbit by "a similar accident."²⁸ But how many such "accidents" may one be permitted to invoke to prop up a theory already tottering under the weight of its own unproved assumptions? Asimov further states that retrograde satellites are "minor exceptions" to the general rule of satellite orbits. But eleven out of thirty-one moons having retrograde orbits can hardly be brushed aside as "minor exceptions"! After attempting to explain possible ways in which Jupiter might have captured its retrograde satellites, Professor W. M. Smart concludes: "The mathematical problem is obviously one of the utmost difficulty and complexity, and it is hardly surprising that the suggestion of satellite capture in the way roughly indicated as it affects Jupiter has not been lifted out of the trough of speculation into the higher levels of mathematical demonstration."²⁹ Professor Layzer of Harvard makes it clear that "the fragments of a rotating disk must all revolve in the same sense. Thus the nebular hypothesis must attribute a sep-

arate origin to the retrograde satellites. Usually they are believed to have been captured, a view which was easier to accept in the days when retrograde orbits were exceedingly rare than it is now, when no less than twelve are known"³⁰

(7) The Problem of the Distribution of Angular Momentum in Satellite Systems.

It was pointed out earlier that the nine planets carry 98% of the angular momentum of the solar system. Even if this could be explained by evolutionary theory -- and it cannot! -- the problem of the distribution of angular momentum in satellite systems still remains. Professor Layzer explains the problem as follows:

Except in the Earth-Moon system (which is exceptional in other respects as well), the primary carries the bulk of the angular momentum, instead of the satellites. This happens partly because the satellite systems are more compact than the primary system; the distances of the satellites from their primaries, measured in units of the radius of the primary, are systematically smaller than the distances of the planets from the Sun, measured in units of the solar radius. But in addition, the planets rotate more rapidly, for their densities, than the Sun, as is evident from their greater degree of flattening. This circumstance aggravates the theoretical difficulty presented by the slow rotation of the Sun, for if the Sun has somehow managed to get rid of the angular momentum it would be expected to have, according to the nebular hypothesis, why have the planets not done likewise?³¹

(8) The Problem of the Moon.

Though the Moon is not the largest planetary satellite in the solar system, it is much the largest in proportion to the size of its mother planet, with a diameter that is more than a quarter the size of the earth's and more than two-thirds the size of Mercury's. For this reason, as Arthur Beiser points out, "modern thought on the formation of the solar system regards the moon as a legitimate planet, which either took shape as a near twin from the same cosmic raw material that the earth began with or, forming elsewhere in the same general zone, was captured later by the earth to make up the present double system."³² But Beiser recognizes that this view of the Moon's origin faces very serious difficulties, for he goes on to state: "From observations that yield the moon's dimensions and its mass, we know that the moon has an average density a full third less than the density of the earth. If both bodies were formed of much the same stuff, what accounts for this discrepancy?"³³ No answer is given to this question.

At the present time, astronomers have no generally accepted theory concerning the origin of the Moon. The British astronomer, George Darwin (son of Charles), discovered about 1890 that the Moon is receding from the earth at the rate of five inches a year. By means of a typically unitarian extrapolation, he concluded that about four billion years ago the Moon was pulled out of the earth, leaving the Pacific Basin as the scar which marks the point of its departure, and that it has been receding ever since! Many scientists still accept this view, including George Gamow,³⁴ in spite of the fact that another British astronomer, Harold Jeffreys, proved in 1931 that such a separation of the Moon from the earth would have been physically impossible. "Since then," writes Harold C. Urey, "most astronomers have agreed with him."³⁵ What, then, does the gradual recession of the Moon prove concerning its origin? Nothing whatever! This point should be carefully pondered by those who insist that present processes are an infallible key to the past.

(9) The Problem of Heavier Elements in the Smaller Planets.

Professor Fred Hoyle, renowned cosmologist of Cambridge University, points to yet another problem for the nebular hypothesis:

Apart from hydrogen and helium, all other elements are extremely rare, all over the universe. In the sun they amount to only about 1% of the total mass. Contrast this with the earth and the other planets where hydrogen and helium make only about the same contribution as highly complex atoms like iron, calcium, silicon, magnesium, and aluminum. The contrast brings out two important points. First, we see that material torn from the sun would not be at all suitable for the formation of the planets as we know them. Its composition would be hopelessly wrong. And our second point in this contrast is that it is the sun that is normal and the earth that is the freak. The interstellar gas and most of the stars are composed of material like the sun, not like the earth. You must understand that, cosmically speaking, the room you are now sitting in is made of the wrong stuff. You yourself are a rarity. You are a cosmic collector's piece.³⁶

Very ingenious and complicated theories have had to be devised to explain the high proportion of heavy elements in the earth and the other small planets. It will be recalled from an earlier section of the paper that Kuiper invoked the concept of a dust-cloud composed of almost exactly the same proportion of elements now found in the solar system, which gradually condensed into the Sun and its planets, with the pressure of sunlight dispersing the lighter gases (hydrogen and helium primarily) from the small, inner planets (Mercury, Venus, Earth, and Mars). Difficult as it is to imagine such a process taking place, it is nothing compared to the difficulty of imagining how such a dust-cloud originated in the first place! George Gamow believes that our present universe started from an exceedingly dense core of protons and neutrons which exploded in a "big bang" about five billion years ago. By a rapid succession of neutron captures and electron decays, all the elements were built up in the first few minutes, and the fleeing matter thereafter formed stars, planets, and galaxies. Gamow worked out his theory with impressive mathematical detail, and most cosmogonists today accept the basic outline of this hypothesis.³⁷

Nevertheless, Gamow's "big bang" theory of the origin of the elements faces some insuperable difficulties. The first of these, as William A. Fowler of the California Institute of Technology frankly admits, is beyond any hope of scientific solution: "How the protons and neutrons themselves were created is a question outside the province of this article: only men of strong convictions, religious or scientific, have the courage to deal with the problem of the creation."³⁸ Beyond this, however, are yet other "difficulties to which Gamow's collaborators Ralph A. Alpher and Robert C. Herman have themselves called attention."

The most serious is the fact that in the sequence of atomic weights numbers 5 and 8 are vacant. That is, there is no stable atom of mass 5 or of mass 8...The question then is: How can the build-up of elements by neutron capture get by these gaps? The process could not go beyond helium 4, and even if it spanned this gap it would be stopped again at mass 8. In short, if neutron capture were the only process by which elements could be built, starting with hydrogen, the build-up would get no farther than helium. This basic objection to Gamow's theory is a great disappointment, in view of the promise and philo-

sophical attractiveness of the idea. The other major current hypothesis is less simple and less elegant; it complicates the picture by invoking other processes, in addition to neutron capture, to account for the build-up of the elements. But it seems to surmount the difficulties encountered by the Gamow hypothesis. The theory argues that the elements were built not in a primordial explosion but in the hot interior of stars.³⁹

Fowler devotes the remainder of his article to a highly speculative discussion of the numerous complicated processes that must be imagined to explain the evolution of heavier elements. Starting with a universe consisting of a cold, dilute and turbulent gas of hydrogen atoms, the theory assumes that part of the gas condensed into stars which became hot enough to produce some carbon 12 out of rare fusions of beryllium 8 with helium 4. Other elements were formed as the temperature continued to rise, until finally the iron group (around atomic weight 56) appeared. Having burned up all their internal fuel, these primeval stars exploded and flung "a considerable amount of iron," together with lighter elements, into interstellar space. Out of this cold nebula of gas and dust "second generation" stars condensed, produced still heavier elements, exploded again into interstellar space, and finally condensed into the solar system! "Of course this scheme is still highly tentative," admits Fowler. "It is disconcerting that so many different processes have to be invoked; it would be much more satisfactory to see a single process that could build up all the elements. The picture may, however, become simpler as more research is done."⁴⁰

Unfortunately for the theory of evolution, the picture is not becoming "simpler as more research is done." Instead, the complexity of the physical universe multiplies as each new discovery is made. It might not be entirely inappropriate to suggest that the easiest way out of the cosmogonical dilemma, as far as modern science is concerned, would be to suppose that all the elements came into existence in the form of gas and dust clouds -- out of nowhere! Perhaps some readers will be astonished to learn that this is actually the "explanation" now being advocated for the origin of all hydrogen atoms in the universe, by Fred Hoyle, Hermann Bondi, and Thomas Gold of Cambridge University, William H. McCrea of the University of London, and other "steady-state" cosmologists who strongly oppose Gamow's "big-bang" theory of the origin of the universe. Professor Hoyle explains:

I find myself forced to assume that the nature of the Universe requires continuous creation -- the perpetual bringing into being of new background material...The most obvious question to ask about continuous creation is this: Where does the created material come from? It does not come from anywhere. Material appears -- it is created. At one time the various atoms composing the material do not exist, and at a later time they do. This may seem a very strange idea, and I agree that it is, but in science it does not matter how strange an idea may seem so long as it works...Hydrogen is being steadily converted into helium throughout the universe, and this conversion is a one-way process -- that is to say, hydrogen cannot be produced in any appreciable quantity through the breakdown of other elements. How comes it then that the universe consists almost entirely of hydrogen? If matter were infinitely old, this would be quite impossible. So we see that the universe being what it is, the creation issue simply cannot be dodged. And I think that of all the various possibilities that have been suggested, continuous creation is easily the most satisfactory.⁴¹

But if hydrogen atoms continue to pop out of nowhere, why not all the other elements too? In other words, if modern science cannot explain the origin of the basic building blocks of the universe (whether protons, neutrons, or hydrogen atoms), why should it bother to explain the origin of the more complex elements? If modern science cannot explain the origin of the earth, the Moon, and the Sun, why should it bother to explain the origin of the universe beyond? The fact of the matter is that science steps out of its proper domain when it dogmatizes, or even speculates, concerning ultimate origins. God has seen to it that mere human logic and searching will never succeed in this area, for it is only through special revelation that God has partially unveiled the mysteries of creation "in the beginning." Not by cosmogonical speculation, then, but "by faith" we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear" (Heb. 11:3).

But have not the currently popular cosmological and cosmogonical theories been solidly established upon extremely intricate and impressive mathematical foundations? Yes, but equally brilliant mathematicians are "demonstrating" mutually exclusive cosmologies! Bernard Jaffe describes the present state of affairs in cosmology as follows:

The theoretician supplements Einstein's principles by functions of his own, adding a new symbol here, removing another there, changing coefficients or exponents, rearranging the formulas when new difficulties appear or new interpretations occur to him. Every line represents the creation of a new universe; every sheet of paper that is crumpled and tossed into the wastepaper basket signifies a universe destroyed. In the morning he constructs and in the evening he tears down, god and demon at once.⁴²

One prominent scientist, in reviewing the intricately developed cosmogonical theory of another scientist, warned that "only the alert reader will be aware that, concealed behind the apparently conservative mathematics, there is a precarious inverted pyramid of speculation after speculation, interlarded with slippery assumptions."⁴³ What may the Christian conclude from all of this? In the words of Paul A. Zimmerman,

No theory is better or stronger than its assumptions. Without good grounds for accepting the assumptions, the whole structure hangs suspended in the sky by the thread of imagination... From all this a Christian pastor may draw the conclusion that he may with truth tell his people that current materialistic propaganda regarding cosmological theories is just that -- propaganda, unsupported by fact! The Biblical account of creation by Almighty God has not been disproved by science. It remains today, even from the viewpoint of reason, I believe, the most logical, believable account of the beginning of the earth and the rest of the universe.⁴⁴

III. It Underestimates God's Special Revelation in Scripture

In the light of the utter failure of uniformitarian evolution to explain the origin of the elements, the stars, and the planets, it is very disappointing to find leading evangelical exponents of the double-revelation theory appealing to Gamow's "big-bang" hypothesis of an expanding universe as support for the Biblical doctrine of creation! In the first of a series of articles on "The Story of

Creation," Christian Life magazine invited J. Laurence Kulp, Karl Turekian, and Donald R. Carr of Columbia University's Lamont Geological Observatory, and Russell Mixter and Howard Claasen of Wheaton College to discuss "The Origin of the Universe." These writers concluded:

A simple calculation shows that about five billion years ago all matter was in one spot. An "explosion" occurred at that time and the fragments have been flying apart since to give us an expanding universe...How did the creative act take place? An increasing number of evangelical Christian scientists and theologians can now be said to take the following position...All the elements of the universe must have been created within a half hour. Within less than 400 million years, the gas composed of 90 per cent hydrogen had drifted apart to a great extent and the temperature had dropped down to that of a comfortably warm room. There were none of the sparkling stars of today at that time -- only a gigantic dark ball of gas at low pressure... Some 500 million years after the universe was started (about 1/10 of universe history) the earth came into being.⁴⁵

The effort of these evangelical scientists to harmonize the "big bang" theory with the Biblical account of creation becomes somewhat ludicrous when they invoke Hebrews 11:3 ("through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear") to support the idea that the visible universe has developed from "invisible" atomic particles! Bernard Ramm effectively disposes of this interpretation, though in many other respects he accepts the double-revelation theory:

If this is the correct interpretation it means that all scientists who believe in the atomic theory have the faith of Hebrews 11! Belief in protons, photons, positrons and electrons is put on the same level as faith in God's power and promises. It is absurd to assert that an atheist's faith in atomic theory is the same faith as that of Hebrews 11...Ex nihilo creation is distinctly Biblical and foreign to Greek thinking, and it is ex nihilo creation which we perceive by faith. To assert then that "the things which do not appear" refers to invisible atoms, and not the word of God (the divine agency of creation) is to directly contradict the teaching of this verse. It would make the verse mean: God created the world from previously existing invisible atoms. But that is precisely what the passage seeks to deny for it seeks to tell us that the visible universe was brought into existence ex nihilo by a spiritual God and a spiritual power, namely, the word of God.⁴⁶

It is significant that just eighteen months after this article appeared in Christian Life, Gamow himself frankly admitted that the "big-bang" theory could not explain the origin of most of the elements!

We know that hydrogen and helium do in fact make up about 99 percent of the matter of the universe. This leaves us with the problem of building the heavier elements. I hold to the opinion that some of them were built by capture of neutrons. However, since the absence of any stable nucleus of atomic weight 5 makes it improbable that the heavier elements could have been produced in the first half hour in the abundances now observed, I would agree that the lion's share of the heavy elements may well have been formed later in the hot interior of stars.⁴⁷

This is not an isolated instance. Time and time again, Christians have been pressured into adopting some popular scientific theory only to discover, to their sorrow and embarrassment, that they had succeeded in "harmonizing" Scripture to a scientific concept that was proved to be erroneous after all. As someone has well said, the person who becomes wedded to the scientific cosmology of one generation will find himself widowed in the next. Man's understanding of the universe continues to change as he learns more and more of its intricate and marvellous structure; but God's Word never changes, for it is the direct product of an infinite and unchanging God.

It is not surprising that Christians who prefer to accept the Biblical doctrine of origins find themselves under continual pressure, not only from secular scientists, but also from evangelical scientists who adhere tenaciously to the double-revelation theory. For example, Dr. J. Laurence Kulp, one of the contributors to the Christian Life article cited above, feels that it is the height of presumption for Christians to call into question a theory of the origin of the universe that the majority of modern scientists accept:

It may be theologically undesirable for those who hold a particular doctrine of creation to accept the "hot hydrogen hypothesis" of the origin of the universe, but certainly it is not for a theologian to reject the hypothesis that is held in one form or another by practically all scientists in cosmology on scientific grounds...Apparently we are to let the theologians pontificate all knowledge of the physical world and dare not investigate any of it. The first stage of all scientific investigation is guessing (forming hypotheses) prior to testing. Why should the first stage of the created universe be any less subject to study than any other part of history? How the acceptance of a particular theory of the first stage of the universe involves one in total evolution is not understandable.⁴⁸

Even more serious than this statement, as far as the Biblical doctrine of creation is concerned, is Dr. Kulp's insistence that any other view than the uniformitarian view of origins would make God a deceiver of mankind!

Christians should believe in a generally uniform universe and keep themselves informed as to the best factual information about their universe. Such a concept does not rule out miracles nor make them deists. Since the God of the Christian is a God of truth, He would not willfully deceive any more than willfully lie. Therefore, a single probable interpretation of the physical-chemical data of the universe remains which shows it to have had a history billions of years long. If we accepted the idea that God deceived man about the origin and development of the universe, how can we believe in Him for any other truth.⁴⁹

What is the full significance of this statement? In the first place, Dr. Kulp seems to be saying that the evidences in support of a uniformitarian interpretation of the origin and development of the universe are so consistent, powerful, and undeniable, that God Himself would be a deceiver if this view turned out to be wrong after all! We would suggest that the reader check again the nine problems listed earlier in this paper if he is tempted to believe that there is "a single probable interpretation of the physical-chemical data of the universe." A survey of the history of science reveals thousands of instances where scientists throughout the entire western world have held completely erroneous ideas concerning the laws and the structure of the material universe. Until the beginning of the 17th century, practically all astronomers in the Christian world believed that the

Sun revolved around the earth -- and taught the Church to believe this too! Until the middle of the 19th century, scientists believed in the spontaneous generation of life. And not until the 20th century was the strongly-held concept of the indestructibility of matter finally exploded. Are we justified in blaming God for these erroneous views held by all leading scientists for centuries? Is God a deceiver because man is not omniscient and infallible in his insights concerning the natural world around him?

A second, and even more serious, implication of Dr. Kulp's statement is that God has nowhere revealed to mankind the true interpretation of how the universe began. But what about the Book of Genesis? Does not this book shed some light on the question? It is exactly at this point that the true character of the double-revelation theory is manifested. Basic to this theory is a serious underestimation of the significance of Scripture in the modern cosmological and cosmogonical debate. Kulp states:

Some theologians assume that the results of science in space can be accepted but those in time rejected. This occurs because of their paucity of knowledge about science. Matter, energy, space and time are indissolubly related. When we wish to learn in some detail what was or is in the material universe, we cannot get this information from the Scriptures. They are simply not a textbook on the material world. They were not intended to be. References to natural phenomena are brief, general, and non-technical.⁵⁰

To be sure, there is some truth to the oft-repeated cliché that the Bible is not a textbook on science. But it is also true that the Scriptures are inerrant and authoritative wherever they do speak on matters that overlap the so-called domains of the scientist and the historian, and such occasions are neither rare nor obscure. For example, there is a remarkable amount of clear Biblical evidence to show that Adam and Eve received their bodies by supernatural, direct creation (rather than by an evolutionary process); that before the Edenic curse there was no death, disease, or violence anywhere in the earth; that the immediate descendants of Adam and Eve were not illiterate savages; that the human race has not been in existence for scores or hundreds of thousands of years; that the Noahic Deluge was geographically universal; and that the present distribution of the human race traces back to the Tower of Babel and God's judgment upon it.⁵¹

Furthermore, it is the writer's conviction that the Scriptures clearly teach that the heavens, the earth, the sea, and the various kinds of plants and animals were brought into existence as "mature" and functioning entities by the direct and supernatural power of God.⁵² Some have argued that God may have chosen to tell the story of creation in terms of direct creation rather than in terms of evolution, because early man could not have understood an evolutionary concept. But this is simply not true. The ancient Greeks believed in various evolutionary ideas of the origin of life, and if evolution were true, God could very easily have directed Moses to write the first two chapters of Genesis in such a way as to convey this idea accurately.⁵³ It is not, then, a question of whether God has deceived scientists concerning the matter of origins if Genesis should turn out to be true. The real question is whether God has deceived those who have taken the Book of Genesis seriously if the modern uniformitarian and evolutionary view of origins should turn out to be true.

CONCLUSION

The time has come when evangelical Christians must strongly challenge the popular notion that modern science provides an independent and equally authoritative source of information with the Bible concerning such doctrines as the original creation, the Edenic curse, and the Noahic Flood, and that science alone is competent to tell us when and how such things occurred (or even whether they occurred!), while the Bible merely informs us "in non-technical language" as to who brought these things about and why. The truth of the matter is that the Word of God not only provides us with the only reliable source of information as to the when and how of these great supernatural events (to say nothing of the who and why in each case), but also tells us why the unaided human intellect is utterly incompetent to arrive at the correct answers in such matters (cf. Rom. 1:18-23; 3:11; I Cor. 1:19-29; 2:14; Heb. 11:1-6; II Pet. 3:3-5). Our Lord's condemnation of the sceptical Sadducees of His day adequately expresses the basic problem facing all modern uniformitarian cosmogonists: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God" (Matt. 22:29).

We are far from denying, of course, that God has given to men a revelation of Himself in the material universe, for the Bible definitely teaches this in Psalm 19:1 ("the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork") and in Romans 1:20 ("for the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity"). Furthermore, God commanded Adam to "subdue" the earth (Gen. 1:28), and we may presume that this command finds partial expression in the marvellous inventions and discoveries which God has permitted to His creatures.

But there are a great number of supremely important truths that the material universe can never reveal to the searching eye of man, even if he could bring an unfallen mind and a pure heart to the investigation of its wonders. It is for this reason that God, in His infinite grace and love, has given to us in the Bible the supreme and only authoritative revelation concerning the Persons of the Trinity, the original creation, the nature of man, the Fall and Edenic curse, the Tower of Babel, the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants, the miracles of Moses, Elijah, and other prophets, the incarnation, atoning death, and bodily resurrection of Christ, the nature and purpose of the Church, the unseen world of spirit beings (including Satan), the Second Coming of Christ, the future judgments, heaven and hell, and many other vitally important truths that are completely outside the scope of scientific investigation. In other words, cosmogony, cosmology, and metaphysics, in the ultimate sense of these terms (and no other sense is truly valid) are impossible apart from God's special revelation in Scripture! The true scientist, therefore, no less than the true theologian, must confess with David: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path...in thy light shall we see light" (Psa. 119:105; 36:9).

In view of all this, the Christian may have perfect confidence that science can make no ultimately fruitful discoveries that are not in perfect accord with the clear and obvious teachings of God's Word. Some, indeed, will consider this to be an unwarranted restriction on their intellectual freedom, and a stumbling block in their pathway as they seek to "follow truth wherever it may lead." But exactly the opposite results will be experienced by those who allow the Scriptures to be their guide in such matters, for the omniscient and truthful Saviour has promised us: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

DOCUMENTATION

1. Richard K. Curtis, "Language and Theology," Gordon Review (Sept., 1955; Dec., 1956; Feb., 1957).
2. Edward J. Carnell, The Case For Orthodox Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 111; Everett F. Harrison, "The Phenomena of Scripture," chap. 15 in Revelation and the Bible, edited by Carl F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), p. 249.
3. John H. Kromminga, "How Shall We Understand Infallibility?" Acts of Synod, 1959, of the Christian Reformed Church, pp. 570 ff; George Stob, "Infallibility," a lecture reported by Joseph Hill in Torch and Trumpet (Jan., 1960), p. 6.
4. Loc. cit.
5. Bernard Ramm, in a review of J. I. Packer's book, "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God, in Eternity (March, 1959), p. 40; and Billy Graham, in a letter to the editor, Eternity (Nov., 1958), pp. 18-19.
6. For a refutation of the "linguistics theory," see Roger Nicole's articles in Gordon Review, Dec., 1955, and May, 1957. On the "non-inspired sources theory," see Joseph A. Hill, "The Bible and Non-Inspired Sources," and J. Barton Payne, "Hermeneutics as a Cloak for the Denial of Scriptures," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, Fall, 1960, pp. 78-81, 97-98; James O. Buswell, Jr., and R. Laird Harris, "Review of The Case for Orthodox Theology," The Bible Presbyterian Reporter (Dec., 1960, pp. 17-18); and Zane C. Hodges, "Conflicts in the Biblical Account of the Ammonite-Syrian War," Bibliotheca Sacra (July, 1962, pp. 238 ff.). On the "peripheral matters theory," see Edward J. Young, Thy Word is Truth (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957), pp. 256, 269; and "Report No. 24: Infallibility and Inspiration in the Light of Scripture and the Creeds," Agenda, 1961, of the Christian Reformed Church, pp. 119-194. In refutation of the views that the nature of Biblical inspiration must be determined by an inductive study of the phenomena of Scripture and that verbal inspiration is merely a human theory, see Theodore Engelder, Scripture Cannot Be Broken (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. Co., 1944); Stonehouse and Woolley (eds.), The Infallible Word (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1946); John F. Walvoord (ed.), Inspiration and Interpretation (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957; and chapters 7 and 8 (by Alan M. Stibbs and Pierre Marcel) in Revelation and the Bible, edited by Carl F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958).
7. Recent expressions of the double-revelation theory may be found in the following articles and books: Richard H. Bube, "God's Revelations in True Science and in the Scriptures," The Collegiate Challenge (Dec., 1961, p. 9); Wilbur L. Bullock, "Evolution Versus Creation -- In Retrospect and Prospect," Gordon Review (Summer, 1959, p. 79); John De Vries and Donald C. Boardman, Essentials of Physical Science (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1958), p. 304; Walter R. Hearn and Richard A. Hendry, "The Origin of Life," in Evolution and Christian Thought Today, edited by Russell L. Mixter (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1959), pp. 67-70; Ulric Jelinek, "A Scientist Contemplates the Universe and Its Creator," The Collegiate Challenge (Oct., 1961, p. 14); Edward L. Kessel, "Let's Look at Facts, Without Bent or Bias," in The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe, edited by John C. Monsma (N. Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958), p. 52; J. Laurence Kulp, "The Christian Concept of Uniformity in the Universe," His (May, 1952), pp. 15-24; Arthur W. Kuschke, Jr., in a review of John C. Whitcomb, Jr. and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood, in The Westminster Theological Journal (May, 1962), pp. 221-223; Jan Lever, Creation and Evolution (Grand Rapids: Kregel's, 1958, p. 21; Russell L. Mixter, "Man in Creation," Christian Life (Oct. 1961, p. 25);

- Bernard Ramm, The Christian View of Science and Scripture (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954), p. 104; N. H. Ridderbos, Is There A Conflict Between Genesis 1 and Natural Science? (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957), p. 46; George K. Schweitzer, "The Origin of the Universe," in Evolution and Christian Thought Today, edited by Russell L. Mixer (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1959), pp. 34, 35, 48; Aldert van der Ziel, The Natural Sciences and the Christian Message (Minneapolis: T. S. Denison & Co., 1960), p. 218.
8. See John W. Klotz, Genes, Genesis, and Evolution (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1955); Paul A. Zimmerman (ed.), Darwin, Evolution, and Creation (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1959); and John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood (Nutley, N. J.: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1962). Among biologists who have given up evolution because it fails to give adequate explanations for the phenomena are N. Heribert Nilsson, Synthesische Artbildung (Lund, Sweden: Verlag CWE Gleerup, 1953), an 1130-page, two-volume work in German, with a 100-page English summarization; W. R. Thompson, Introduction to Charles Darwin: The Origin of Species, Everyman's Library #811 (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.; and N. Y. E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1958), pp. vii - xxv; and G. A. Kerkut, Implications of Evolution (N. Y.: Pergamon Press, 1960).
 9. For a brief and helpful analysis of each major theory of the origin of the solar system, see W. M. Smart, The Origin of the Earth (rev. edit.; Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1959), pp. 179-207.
 10. David Bergamini, Life Nature Library: The Universe (N. Y.: Time Incorporated, 1962), pp. 92-93.
 11. Gerald P. Kuiper, in Astrophysics, A Topical Symposium, edited by J. A. Hynek (N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1951), quoted by Paul A. Zimmerman, "Some Observations on Current Cosmological Theories," Concordia Theological Monthly (July, 1953), p. 449.
 12. Fred L. Whipple, Scientific American (May, 1948), p. 35. Cited by Zimmerman, loc. cit., p. 502.
 13. Kuiper, op. cit., cited by Zimmerman, loc. cit., p. 499.
 14. Zimmerman, loc. cit., p. 504.
 15. Ibid., p. 500.
 16. Bergamini, op. cit., p. 92.
 17. Harold C. Urey, "The Origin of the Earth," Scientific American (Oct., 1952), p. 56.
 18. Zimmerman, loc. cit., p. 504.
 19. David Layzer, "Cosmogony," McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology (N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), III, 506.
 20. Bergamini, op. cit., p. 93.
 21. Ibid., pp. 93-94.
 22. Layzer, op. cit., p. 508. Smart, op. cit., p. 204, would agree with Layzer.
 23. Bergamini, op. cit., p. 92.
 24. Layzer, loc. cit.
 25. Isaac Asimov, The Intelligent Man's Guide to Science (N. Y.: Basic Books, Inc., 1960), I, 78.
 26. Layzer, loc. cit.
 27. Smart, op. cit., pp. 88-89.
 28. Asimov, loc. cit. Cf. also, W. M. Smart, op. cit., pp. 92-93.
 29. Smart, op. cit., p. 91.
 30. Layzer, loc. cit.
 31. Ibid., underlining ours.

32. Arthur Beiser, Life Nature Library: The Earth (N. Y.: Time Inc., 1962), 14.
33. Ibid., p. 15.
34. George Gamow, Matter, Earth, and Sky (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 454.
35. Harold C. Urey, "The Origin of the Earth," Scientific American (October, 1952), p. 55.
36. Fred Hoyle, Harper's Magazine (April, 1951), p. 64. Quoted in Zimmerman, loc. cit., p. 55.
37. George Gamow, "The Evolutionary Universe," Scientific American (Sept., 1956), pp. 136 ff.
38. William A. Fowler, "The Origin of the Elements," Scientific American (Sept., 1956), p. 85.
39. Loc. cit., pp. 87-88.
40. Loc. cit., p. 91. Cf. Gamow, Matter, Earth, and Sky, pp. 555-58. Gamow had earlier denounced this view as comparable to "the request of an inexperienced housewife who wanted three electric ovens for cooking a dinner: one for the turkey, one for the potatoes, and one for the pie. Such an assumption of heterogeneous cooking conditions, adjusted to give the correct amounts of light, medium-weight, and heavy elements would completely destroy the simple picture of atom-making by introducing a complicated array of specially designed 'cooking facilities.'" The Creation of the Universe (Mentor Books. N. Y.: The New American Library, 1960; written in 1952), pp. 56-57.
41. Fred Hoyle, Harper's Magazine (Feb., 1951), p. 68. Underlining is ours. Quoted by Zimmerman, loc. cit., pp. 510-11.
42. Quoted by Rudolph Thiel, And There Was Light (N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), p. 390.
43. Kirtley Mather of Harvard University, in a review of Fred Hoyle, The Nature of the Universe, in American Scientist (July, 1951), p. 481. Quoted by Zimmerman, loc. cit., p. 510.
44. Zimmerman, loc. cit., pp. 512-13.
45. Christian Life (March, 1955), pp. 16-17.
46. Bernard Ramm, The Christian View of Science and Scripture (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954), p. 128. The Christian Life article (p. 16) refers to the original creative act as "spontaneous" but appeals to Gamow's theory to explain it. This is quite contradictory.
47. George Gamow, "The Evolutionary Universe," Scientific American (Sept., 1956), p. 154. Underlining is ours.
48. J. Laurence Kulp, "The Christian Concept of Uniformity in the Universe," His Magazine, (May, 1952), p. 24. How far Kulp has travelled on the road to total uniformitarianism may be judged by another statement in this article: "Miracles should not be described as acts whereby God breaks His laws but rather as acts whereby He superimposes higher laws to effect His purposes. They are 'higher' only in the sense that man has not been permitted to discover them yet. Thus miracles occur from definite causes and the effect should be reproducible" (p. 16 - underlining ours).
49. Loc. cit., p. 24. Underlining is ours.
50. Loc. cit., p. 16.
51. See J. C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub. Co., 1962), pp. 454-89.
52. Cf. Exodus 20:11. See John W. Klotz, Genes, Genesis, and Evolution (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1955), pp. 86-116; Raymond F. Surburg, "In the Beginning God Created," Chapter 2 in Darwin, Evolution, and Creation, edited by Paul A. Zimmerman (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1959), pp. 37-80; and Whitcomb and Morris, op. cit., pp. 232-39, 344.
53. Cf. Wilbert H. Rusch, "Darwinism, Science, and the Bible," Chapter 1 in Darwin, Evolution, and Creation, pp. 5-12.

THE PROBLEM OF THE EFFICACY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICES

HOBART E. FREEMAN
Instructor in Old Testament
Grace Theological Seminary

It was at one time rather popular among critical scholars to emphasize a strong distinction between the Levitical and prophetic elements in the Old Testament, and either condemning outright the former, or minimizing its spiritual importance. Historically the Levitical element was as essential to the religious life and development of Israel as the prophetic. It formed the framework, as it were, without which the continuity of the religious life of the Jewish nation would have been impossible.

No valid distinction can be made between the Levitical (or ceremonial) and prophetic (or moral) elements of the Old Testament, since each was divinely instituted to serve its proper purpose. Such a separation is unbiblical and foreign to Old Testament thought. Throughout Israel's history the moral was taught through the ceremonial, the ceremonial being the necessary vehicle for the expression of the moral. The Jewish sacrifices were, by divine intention, to reflect the moral truths of obedience, self-sacrifice, self-dedication, love for and devotion to God, recognition of sin, repentance, and many other spiritual conceptions. Throughout the Old Testament the moral interprets the ritual and the ceremonial gives meaning to the ethical. It is indeed a narrow view of Old Testament sacrifice to fail to see in its institution moral, ethical, and spiritual elements. There was pervading the idea of sacrifice a principle of righteousness. Sacrifice was the divinely appointed means of securing a right standing before God in the Mosaic dispensation, and it is faulty hermeneutics to interpret Old Testament sacrificial concepts in terms of New Testament theology alone. It cannot be overemphasized that the interpreter of Old Testament thought, practices, and theological concepts must constantly remind himself that the Old Testament Hebrew did not have at his disposal the Epistle to the Romans and its revelation of righteousness without the law "even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ..." (Rom. 3:31-22), nor did he have the Hebrews' Epistle and its testimony to the nature of Old Testament sacrifice as being typical and a shadow of the good things to come. This of course is not to deny the necessity of faith on the part of the Israelite, but to emphasize the proper importance and place of divinely instituted sacrifice and Mosaic worship in its dispensation.

The interpreter of Old Testament sacrifice should be aware of two things often overlooked. First, to follow to its logical conclusion the idea that the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices were merely typical or efficacious only with respect to ceremonial sins, and had no real importance, results in the denial of the importance of a great portion of the Pentateuch itself, especially Leviticus in its entirety, and a great part of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Such a view can

This article was originally presented as a paper for the Seventh General Meeting of the Midwestern Section of the Evangelical Theological Society, May 4, 1962, at Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, and appeared in the Summer 1962 issue of the E.T.S. Bulletin.

give no satisfactory reason for the institution of sacrifice at all. The second factor often overlooked in Old Testament sacrifice is that sacrifice was not to the Hebrew some crude, temporary, and merely typical institution, nor a substitute for that dispensation until better things were provided by revelation, but, as will be shown, sacrifice was then the only sufficient means of remaining in harmonious relation to God. It was adequate for the period in which God intended it should serve. This is not the same as saying Levitical sacrifice was on an equal with the sacrifice of Christ, nor that the blood of bulls and goats could, from God's side, take away sins; but it is recognizing the reality of the divine institution of Mosaic worship, and looking, as too often Old Testament interpreters fail to do, at sacrifice from the viewpoint of the Hebrew in the Old Testament dispensation. Sacrifice, to the pious Hebrew, was not something unimportant, or simply a perfunctory ritual, but it was an important element in his moral obedience to the revealed will of God. Sacrifice was by its very nature intensely personal, ethical, moral, and spiritual, because it was intended to reflect the attitude of the heart and will toward God.

It is just at this point that the prophetic assaults upon the sacrificial system can find explanation. The Israelites had come to believe that punctilious attention to sacrificial ritual and ceremony could atone for their sins however great. But this notion was a misconception of the very principle of the ceremonial system which was based upon moral and ethical conduct within the Covenant. The prophets insisted that the people unite moral conduct with their religious observances. This polemic against mere ceremonialism appears in many Old Testament passages (Cf. Ps. 50:23; 40:6-10; 69:30; Isa. 1:11-15; Micah 6:6-8). The two sides to this problem are clearly seen in the words of the Psalmist. He writes in Psalm 51:16-17:

For thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it:
Thou hast no pleasure in burnt-offering.
The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:
A broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

To the superficial observer this would appear as a rejection of sacrifice as a result of the later higher moral concept of religion by the Hebrews. But verse 19 which follows repudiates this view; for after the heart of the worshipper is turned in penitence toward God,

Then wilt thou delight in right sacrifices,
In burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering:
Then will they offer bullocks upon thine altar. (Ps. 51:19 RSV)

Views as to the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifices

To what extent did the Mosaic sacrifices atone? Several views have been proposed by Old Testament expositors. On the one hand, it has been asserted that the Levitical sacrifices had no power to atone for moral transgressions, but simply ceremonial offenses. Keil and Delitzsch moreover, extend this view to include all transgressions, and thereby seemingly render the Old Testament sacrifices meaningless:

...as sin is not wiped out by the death of the sinner, unless it is forgiven by the grace of God, so devoting to death an animal laden with sin rendered neither a real nor symbolical satisfaction or payment for sin, by which the guilt of it could be wiped away; but the death which it endured in the sinner's stead represented merely the fruit and effect of sin.¹

A second view holds that sin was not removed once for all by an animal sacrifice under the law, but simply for a time, --from the interval of one sin-offering to another, or from one day of atonement to another. A third position is that the Mosaic sacrifices, especially the sin and trespass-offerings, made a real atonement for all sins, moral as well as ceremonial, as long as the sacrifices were presented in humble faith and repentance.

In the first view the atoning sacrifice simply reinstated the Israelite to his position as a legal citizen of the covenant community; the second view holds sacrifice to be a temporary relief from divine wrath with no final and complete purging of the conscience. "Else would they not ceased to be offered? because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more consciousness of sins." (Heb. 10:2) The third position contends that the sacrifices were the divinely appointed means of obtaining a real forgiveness of sins, which would be regarded as valid in the counsels of God, and which reinstated the Israelite, not simply to his position as a citizen of the covenant community, but to his position of fellowship with God.

The first view is stated by one writer as follows: "These Old Testament sacrifices availed to 'the flesh,' to ceremonial ends...the sacrifice of Christ avails for the 'conscience,' and removal of guilt in the moral sphere."² This artificial distinction between the moral and ceremonial efficacy of Old Testament sacrifice finds support by its advocates in the alleged denunciations of sacrifice in the prophets and psalms. Such a view of the relation of the ceremonial element to the moral element in Levitical sacrifices is not the Old Testament view at all. In the Levitical law there was, to be sure, a great ceremonial system and ritual, but it was ceremony with an inward meaning. The sacrifice had no efficacy apart from its meaning, but because of the very nature of sacrificial ritual the ceremonial aspect could be, and often was, separable from its true inwardness. It is to this that the prophets address their denunciations, the separation of the ritual from its inward meaning, the perfunctory observance of outward forms without a due sense of their meaning and value.

The Divine Promises

When the Law itself is consulted as to the effects of these sacrifices upon ceremonial, civil, or moral transgression, it is always stated that the effect is the forgiveness of sins, with the Israelite restored to both covenant and spiritual standing.

And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and kill it for a sin-offering... and the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven. (Lev. 4:33,35 ASV, Italics mine.)

The conscience of the pious Israelite, oppressed and burdened with sin, accepted with divine assurance the fact that his sins were removed. This is not the same as saying, however, as the

writer of Hebrews observes, that the frequent animal sacrifices effected a permanent peace and satisfaction for the conscience, "Else would they not ceased to be offered?" (Heb. 10:2) Animal sacrifices were never intended to effect such relief, nor could they, since they did not possess that dynamic operation as the once for all efficacious sacrifice of Christ. Animal sacrifices, on the other hand, had to be offered again and again for the atonement of sins.

But the reality of forgiveness is vouchsafed by the divine promises contained within the Law itself. All sins of weakness and rashness were completely atoned for by the sin-offerings whether done knowingly or unwittingly (Lev. 4-5); by the trespass-offering such sins as lying, theft, fraud, perjury, and debauchery were atoned for (Lev. 6:1-7); and on the Day of Atonement forgiveness was obtained for all the transgressions of Israel, whether people or priests.³

With respect to the efficacy of the Old Testament sacrifices, Thomas J. Crawford's work, The Doctrine of Atonement, is instructive in resolving this question. He writes,

So far as we can learn from the terms of the Mosaic statutes, the sacrifices seem to have been of unailing benefit in all cases in which they were punctually and exactly offered. Their efficacy, such as it was, belonged to them ex opere operato [by outward acts]. The strict observance of the prescribed form was sufficient to secure for any Israelite the acceptance of his sacrifice, to the effect of "making an atonement for his sin that he had committed, so that it should be forgiven him."⁴

Therefore, on the one hand, it seems evident that the Mosaic sacrifices had a certain efficacy ascribed to them in Old Testament Law. It is written again and again in the Book of Leviticus that when the prescribed ritual had been duly performed by the worshipper, the sacrifice offered, and the blood sprinkled, that... "it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (Lev. 1:4). On the Day of Atonement complete cleansing and removal of sins is clearly taught in the ritual of the two goats, in which one was slain and his blood sprinkled upon the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies to propitiate judicial wrath by covering the sins; and the other, after the sins of the people were confessed over it, was sent away into the wilderness bearing the iniquities of the people, thus symbolizing sin's complete removal. It is significant that there is not a word in the ceremony that this great sacrifice made an atonement only with respect to ceremonial sins, but on the contrary, it was an atonement for all the sins of the people. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins" (Lev. 16:21). In the individual sin-offering it is promised that "... the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven" (Lev. 4:35). From all this it is evident that a real atoning efficacy was in some way related to the Mosaic sacrifices by divine appointment. What the nature of this efficacy was will be demonstrated later.

The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews

On the other hand, the New Testament teaching, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, is very emphatic in its declarations that "... the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh" (Heb. 10:11). For they "... cannot, as touching the

conscience, make the worshipper perfect" (Heb. 9:9), since the blood of goats and bulls availed only to "...sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh" (Heb. 9:13), but "how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works ..." (Heb. 9:14), "for it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (Heb. 10:4).

Here would appear to be two apparently opposite views of the efficacy of the Levitical sacrifices. But the reconciliation of the difficulty lies, not in a denial of either the Old or New Testament teachings, but in a harmonization of both. This is accomplished through a study of the two different aspects under which sacrifice is regarded in the Mosaic economy and by the Hebrews' Epistle respectively.

Reconciliation of the Problem

From the worshipper's standpoint the Levitical sacrifices were, in a sense, efficacious in a two-fold way: (1) they healed the breach of covenant relationship which resulted from either ceremonial or moral transgression, and kept secure their civil and ecclesiastical privileges; and (2) they procured also, when offered with unfeigned penitence and humble faith, actual forgiveness for the sinner in that it is clearly stated the sacrifice "...shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven."

It is dishonoring, it seems, to God's word and promise, which is repeated over and over, to contend that the sins under the first covenant were only symbolically, but never really, forgiven. This is to fail to comprehend the meaning and purpose of Old Testament sacrifice and to reduce it to vague and meaningless ritual. This does not really deal with the problem. It simply raises another one--how can we explain the divine promises of forgiveness in Leviticus?

To be sure, the Levitical sacrifices were but shadows of the true, and most assuredly the blood of bulls and goats can never take away sins, but this is looking at the matter both from the New Testament's and from God's viewpoint. That is to say, it is one thing to view the matter from the Old Testament worshipper's viewpoint, who actually participated in the objective ritual of the animal sacrifice, and to whom there was not a word spoken as to these sacrifices being simply objective symbols of inward spiritual truths, for on the contrary, it is expressly stated "he shall be forgiven." It is another matter, however, to look at the question from this side of the cross, in the light of full revelation, and too, to view it from the standpoint of God's intended purposes with regard to sacrifices. It should be noted, however, that this does not mean that a certain understanding of the meaning of the forms was absent, since the ritual ceremonies were educational in value--a process of working from outward form to inner meaning, which resulted in a consciousness of inward communion with God.

The Two-Fold Divine Purpose in Sacrifice

How could God promise the truly repentant worshipper actual forgiveness if the prescribed ritual was properly observed? The solution lies in God's eternal purposes in Old Testament sacrifices. Old Testament ritual and worship may be said to have had a two-fold purpose, one purpose to be revealed and realized in the Old Testament dispensation, the other hidden, and to be realized in the New Testament dispensation.

The Revealed and Realized Purpose

The covenant relationship between God and Israel was expressed in ritual worship. Since the aim of the covenant was the process of sanctification expressed by the words in Leviticus 19:2: "...ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy," the Mosaic ritual was intended as a conscious symbol of this truth. However, the ritual was not simply a system of outward signs of internal truths; but from the standpoint of the worshipper and of the Levitical law, it was the necessary vehicle for the actual realization of forgiveness, and for communion and fellowship between God and Israel within the Covenant. This means that a sacrifice did not symbolize forgiveness of sins and propitiation of God apart from the actual realization of these effects. Sacrifice, in the Old Testament, was not merely a symbol or type, for this is to rob it of all immediate meaning and purpose; but it expressed the transference of legal guilt to the substitute and the imposition of the capital punishment due the sinner, carried out in the act of sacrifice itself. Thus, from the worshipper's standpoint, and on the basis of God's own promises in Leviticus, the Mosaic sacrifices were efficacious in this two-fold sense; they maintained a covenant relationship between God and Israel, and when offered in humble faith and penitence, they secured for the worshipper a valid atonement and the forgiveness of all sins, moral or ceremonial. It is, however, quite a different matter to view the Levitical sacrifices in the light of New Testament revelation and from the standpoint of God's ultimate and hidden purposes. It must be carefully observed, therefore, that whatever efficacy was ascribed to the Levitical sacrifices, it was not inherent within the animal itself, and did not, strictly speaking, belong to the sacrifices themselves, which were symbols, from God's viewpoint, of the Lamb of God.

* Levitical sacrifices were the divinely appointed means of objectively signifying to Israel that man was sinful and that sin was a serious matter which required the forfeiting of one's life and the shedding of blood. Therefore, the Israelites offered animal sacrifices in token of contrition and as a "medium" of pardon. The worshipper might not fully understand how pardon and sacrifice were connected, yet by relying on the divinely-appointed medium and promises, he was actually delivered from the fear which guilt produced, with respect to that particular transgression. The worshipper who confessed his sin over the head of the victim, the blood of which was then applied to the altar, was in a real sense professing the assurance of pardon.

The Hidden and Future Purpose

The direct and immediate efficacy of the sin-offering, on the basis of God's promises, was the securing of forgiveness of sin for the penitent Israelite, and for the entire covenant community on the great Day of Atonement. Atonement was secured, as has been shown, as a result of, and never apart from, the actual ritual sacrifice and death of the animal. Thus the sacrifice itself was the necessary vehicle for securing forgiveness of sins. But it has also been stated that the efficacy did not lie inherently in the animal itself, nor in the Israelite's understanding that the sacrifice he was making was only a shadow and type of the Messiah's sacrifice. How then could God promise the truly penitent worshipper actual forgiveness if the prescribed ritual was properly observed? The solution lies in God's eternal purposes in the Old Testament sacrifices and religious institutions. While they truly atoned for the sins of the worshipper, yet the Old Testament sacrifices were validated in the mind of God on the basis of the all-sufficient, truly efficacious sacrifice of the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world (I Peter 1:20).

It is categorically true that the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sin; but then the Old Testament never says that it did. What God promised to Israel was the forgiveness of sins and restoration to covenant standing to be accomplished through the death and shedding of the blood of an innocent substitute victim. It was the forfeiting of a life for a life, which was declared in the sprinkling of the blood, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life."

On the basis of the grace shown to Israel in her divine election and the institution of the Covenant, God provided, by His mercy, a means for the sinner to draw near to Him continually. This was the Levitical system of sacrifices. He did not command Moses to tell the children of Israel that a lamb without blemish could in itself expiate sins, but He did promise to accept the life of an animal, ceremonially pure, in substitution for the life of the actual transgressor, and in view of this act, would forgive his iniquities. It must not be forgotten that it was God Himself who instituted sacrifices, specified the procedure, and promised forgiveness.

Hence, the apparent contradiction between Leviticus and Hebrews 10:4 where we are told that "... it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins," is reconciled in the fact that the Old Testament sacrifices were efficacious only with respect to God's forgiving grace, and not with respect to the final expiation or removal of the sins themselves.

But forgiveness was promised and guaranteed, according to the Apostle, on the basis of God's future purposes in Christ--the Lamb of God,

Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God. (Rom. 3:25, Italics mine.)

Note also Hebrews 9:15, where the death of Christ, as the Mediator of the new covenant, is said to have been "... for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant ...," the efficacy of His death being regarded by God as retrospective. And again in 9:25 the Apostle states that "...now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Through the all sufficient sacrifice of Christ for sins, God's righteousness was at last vindicated. The Apostle in Romans 3:25 and Hebrews 10:4 confirms the fact that while the Old Testament sacrifices provided forgiveness for the pious Israelite, yet those sins could never be purged away by the blood of bulls and goats, hence they were "passed over"⁵ by the forbearing grace of God until expiated by the sacrifice of Christ.

On account of the eternal purpose of God to punish sin and provide an atonement in His Son, God pardoned the sins of His people under the Old Testament Mosaic dispensation, but they were not actually purged away until covered by the blood of Christ. Owing to the forbearance of His grace He accepted the animal substitutes to make a covering for sin and propitiate His judicial wrath against sin, until in the fulness of time He through His own Lamb would validate all forgiveness granted through atonement by animal types. This means that Christ's atonement was made and

accepted in God's sovereign counsels and foreknowledge before the foundation of the world (1 Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8), so that the humble and repentant worshipper with his sacrifices of the Old Testament was accepted on the ground of it.

DOCUMENTATION

1. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909, p. 305.
2. W. Sanday (ed.), Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900, p. 80.
3. Alfred Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement. Revised ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890, p. 151.
4. Thomas J. Crawford, The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement. 4th ed. revised. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954, p. 249.
5. The Greek word is pareisis meaning "passing by" and is used nowhere else in the New Testament. The term aphesis usually translated "remission" occurs seventeen times, but is not used here. Quite obviously the apostle would not have used a different word here, unless he intended to express a different sense. The Authorized Version is incorrect in rendering pareisis here as "remission"; the ASV corrects this however.

THE PATRIARCHS' KNOWLEDGE OF JEHOVAH

A Critical Monograph on Exodus 6:3
Abridged by the Author

JOHN J. DAVIS

"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them." (Ex. 6:3 A.S.V.)

Anyone who has committed himself to a serious study of the Old Testament is aware of the fact that certain portions of Old Testament history and in particular certain verses have become focal points of critical and theological investigation. The text under consideration is one such text. To a rather large group of Old Testament scholars this verse has been more or less the basic proof text for the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch. Others have either ignored a treatment of the verse or proposed unsupported solutions to the problems it presents. For the conservative scholar, however, it gives unmeasurable light into the relation of the Patriarchs to their God; and more generally, the method and scope of Divine revelation in the Old Testament.

Because Exodus 6:3 has become a basic proof text for the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch, it is imperative that we briefly consider this very popular theory. This theory originated with Jean Astruc, a French physician, who, by the way, did not deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. In his famous treatise, Conjectures Concerning the Original Memoranda which it Appears Moses Used to Compose the Book of Genesis, Astruc proposed that on the basis of the use of divine names two basic documents could be distinguished: one called A (using Elohim) and B (employing Yahweh). It is interesting to note that this idea was applied to Genesis alone. It was not until 1791 that the theory was applied to the entire Pentateuch by Eichhorn. From this time on the variant uses of the Divine names were employed as a basis for distinguishing various documents. The theory gained popularity as the years passed and other methods were also employed to distinguish source material for the Pentateuch. The documentary analysis reached its peak under the leadership of Julius Wellhausen, who died in 1918. This system as it is held today has basically four source documents: (J) Yahwist, presumed to have been written about 850 B.C., (E) or Elohist, about 750 B.C., (D) or Deuteronomy about 620 B.C. and (P) in the completed Pentateuch about 500 B.C. Unlike the view of Astruc, those who advocate this theory today deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Since the days of Wellhausen, there have been many modifications to this classic form of literary criticism of the Pentateuch. The present day efforts are to assume the existence of the documents and extend the analysis even further, that is, back to the "traditions" which are contained in the documents.¹ In this monograph, we shall not endeavor to examine this latter effort in Old Testament criticism. Our major concern is with the basic four document analysis which underlies most of the present day Pentateuchal criticism.

With this rather brief introduction let us proceed to the problems of the text itself.

I. MINOR PROBLEM: What is the significance of the name "El-Shaddai" in relation to the Patriarchs?

There are two basic views in regard to this Problem. We shall consider each with a brief evaluation.

A. The Liberal View: The liberal view generally holds that this name for God is to be traced back to a natural origin. It holds its origin to be like that of the tribal deities of the nations that surrounded the children of Israel in their early history. This view contends that El Shaddai represents a primitive form of worship among the Patriarchs. Their worship, according to this view, was basically the same as the other nations except for the fact that some of their ideas and moral codes were in some aspects higher.

There are many views as to the etymology of this title among liberal scholars, but the one most commonly held is that "Shaddai" comes from the Babylonian "Šadda'u," the gentilic of Šadu, Šaddu, the regular word for mountain. The chief defender of this view is Albright.² Another writer states the liberal position in the following words:

When the Hebrews left Mesopotamia, they brought with them a religion which in many respects was like the nature religion of the Fertile Crescent... Apparently their chief god was known as Shaddai (or El Shaddai), which means "the one of the mountains" - a mountain deity or storm deity usually known by the title Baal (lord) among the Canaanites.³

The liberal view, as previously noted, holds that El-Shaddai was a humanly-conceived mountain god of the Israelites. The relation of El-Shaddai to the Patriarchs, therefore, was merely as a native god, who was only one of many such gods of the land. While this view is extremely popular among the liberal critics, it is not a strong view in the light of Biblical evidence. The refutation of this view is two fold: First, it is a view conceived and based upon a false assumption: namely, that monotheistic religion is a natural evolutionary product of human thought. To this we would reply that religious evolution, upon which this concept is built, is not a proven theory, but a hypothesis; it does not, therefore, provide a sound basis for the liberal view of developed monotheism. Secondly, the Biblical evidence is most clearly against the view that man "conceived" or "became aware" of high moral and religious concepts. The liberal view disregards the many texts which clearly point out the fact that man in his sinful, fallen state, cannot conceive of, and will not seek after a Holy God. (Psalm 14, Romans 3:11-18). Furthermore, this view of the name El-Shaddai does not fit any context in which it appears unless it is forced against the natural reading of the text. The textual and contextual evidence are totally against the idea of this being a "mountain deity."

If the liberal contention were true, we should expect to find indications of a lower moral and religious idea in the use of this name, but such is not the case. The same moral and religious concepts are associated with this name as with the name Yahweh. For example, the blessing is the same (Genesis 17:1). Notice in this text Yahweh says "I am El-Shaddai." It would seem from this statement that identity and equality are asserted of both these names. The moral demand is

"walk before me, and be thou perfect." To contend that Shaddai is merely a mountain deity is to disregard the place the name is given in the Scriptures. Also, in this regard, it should be observed that in some contexts the names Yahweh and El-Shaddai are used alternately with equal majesty and holiness (cf. Ruth 1:20f.).

It should also be noted that this view fails to provide a motive and a reason why the other nations did not evolve into monotheistic concepts. How did Israel, a small nation surrounded by idolatry and sin, rise above nature worship and arrive at a high monotheism while the other nations did not? Without the fact of Divine intervention and revelation, no reasonable answer is possible. On the basis of these facts, and the positive evidence to be presented, the writer considers the liberal view false and untenable.

B. The Conservative view: The basic understanding of the conservative view is that the name "El Shaddai" is of divine, not natural origin. The name, it is asserted, was revealed by God, and not conceived by man. While all conservative scholars agree on this basic principle, there is little agreement as to the etymology and significance of this name in relation to the patriarchs. There are four basic views in this regard. The first view is that Shaddai comes from the root šāḏad "to be strong" or "powerful." This view seems to be the more popular. The emphasis, therefore, in respect to the patriarchs, is that of God's power and strength. Oehler favors this view in his Theology of the Old Testament.⁴

The second view of the name Shaddai is that its root is šāḏad "to destroy" or "to terrify." This view is held by Mack.⁵

The third view maintains that Shaddai comes from a compound word (from še (שֶׁ) and day which in Hebrew means "sufficiency." For a statement of this view compare John Calvin.⁶

The fourth, and not too well accepted view is that proposed by the Scofield Bible.⁷ This view contends that the name comes from šad which has primary reference to the female breast. The name, therefore, signified nourishment and strength to the Patriarchs.

The writer feels the conservative view is the proper view and is the one best supported by the Scriptures. The most probable etymology of this title will be discussed in the following arguments in defense of this view. The arguments for the conservative view are two-fold:

1. Exegetical Argument

The phrase under consideration is in the English, "and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob as God Almighty..." The key words are "appeared" and "God Almighty" in this phrase. The verb 'ēra' (appeared) is the niph'al imperfect first person singular of the root rā'ā. This root has the basic meaning of "to see, to observe, to look at."⁸ The niph'al, however, carries the idea of "letting oneself be seen," or "to appear," when used with 'el or 'e.⁹ The sense of this statement seems to be that to these Patriarchs God "revealed" Himself or made Himself to appear "in the capacity of" El Shaddai. The prepositional prefix be gives the idea of "in the character of" or "in the capacity of."

The name El Shaddai has been the subject of much conjecture and argument especially as to its etymology. The writer has become aware of the fact that this name, apart from Biblical material, may be explained by several suggested roots, which are equally attractive, but he feels that in the light of all evidence that the name Shaddai comes from the root šāḏad which means "to be strong" or "powerful." Supporting this assumption is a well respected lexicographer, Gesenius, who identifies this name thusly:

Shaddai-Almighty, omnipotent as an epithet of Jehovah, sometimes preceded by 'el Gen-esis 17:1, 28:3, Exodus 6:3...¹⁰

The writer will not attempt to argue further on this point, for the argument would be like the liberal argument, purely subjective. He will let the case rest here and proceed to a stronger and more conclusive proof for this position--the contextual argument.

2. Contextual Argument:

The strongest argument in favor of the view that Shaddai comes from šāḏad meaning "to be strong," and that this name characterized Yahweh as the Mighty One or the Almighty who was able to perform the things promised, is found in the contexts in which this name appears both in the Pentateuch and in the other books.

The name Shaddai appears some forty-eight times in the Old Testament. The greater majority of these texts regard Shaddai or El Shaddai in the primary aspect of power and might. Power and might are many times demonstrated in special blessings and acts. In the book of Genesis the name appears only six times (Genesis 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 43:14, 48:3, 49:25) and in almost every case the name is used in connection with some blessing. A careful study of the nature of these blessings will reveal the fact that only an all powerful God could fulfill these promises. The name occurs in Exodus only once (Ex. 6:3), and Numbers twice (Num. 24:4, 24:16). This name really displays its significance in the books of Ruth and Job. In Ruth it occurs only twice (Ruth 1:20,21) but the basic idea connected with it is that of chastisement and affliction. In Job it occurs thirty-one times and has the same idea basically as that in Ruth. In many of the passages the idea connected with this name is decidedly power and majestic glory. (cf. Job 5:17, 6:4,14, 8:3, 15:25, 21:20, 22:25, 23:16, 27:2, 34:12) In Job 37:23 Shaddai is clearly characterized as "excellent in power." In use of the name Shaddai in the Psalms (Ps. 68:14, 91:1) seems to support this meaning also. El-Shaddai is spoken of as "scattering kings," (Psalm 68:14), which is an open display of sovereign power. The other uses of this name, Isa. 13:6, Ezek. 1:24, 10:5 and Joel 1:15 also indicate the same basic idea of power and might.

It will be seen from the preceding material that while other etymologies of the name Shaddai such as šād (breasted one) could possibly apply in one or two texts, the greater majority of occurrences support the idea of power and might. It should be remembered that these names for God in the Old Testament were not used without purpose or plan. It will be shown that when various ideas and acts of God were discussed, the writer under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, carefully selected the name that characterized the God who was performing or was about to perform these acts.

II. MAJOR PROBLEM: Was the name "Yahweh" known to the Patriarchs?

There are three main solutions proposed for this problem. Each shall be stated and evaluated. A more lengthy treatment of the last view will be given because it is considered to be the proper explanation of Exodus 6:3b.

A. First Occurrence View: This view contends that the name Yahweh was not known to the Patriarchs but was first made known to Moses. It generally argues for a natural origin of the name rather than a supernatural revelation of it. This is essentially the view of all liberal Old Testament theologians. John Edgar McFadyen expresses this view as follows:

Of very great importance is the passage, 6:2-13, which describes the revelation given to Moses, asserting that the fathers knew the God of Israel only by the name El Shaddai, while the name of Jehovah, which was then revealed to Moses for the first time, was unknown to them.¹¹

Some holding this view trace the origin of the name back to the Kenites, a branch from the Midianites. This view is expressed by Karl Budde as follows:

"Yahweh, therefore, is the God of the tribe to which Moses, on his flight from Egypt, joined himself by marriage; the mountain god of Horeb, who appears to him and promises him to lead his brethren out of Egypt."¹²

The supposed textual basis for this view is Exodus 18. From this chapter two basic assertions are made which are claimed to be the proof for the origin of the name Yahweh. First, Moses is conceived to be a subordinate to Jethro (Ex. 18:24) and second, Jethro sacrifices to Yahweh (Ex. 18:12). It is concluded therefore, that Jethro, priest of Midian, is in effect a priest of Yahweh. The objections to this view are many.

First: The account in Exodus 18 is hardly a decisive proof of the subordination of Moses to Jethro officially. What Moses received in this chapter was gracious counsel, not an official command.

Second: Verse twelve does not say explicitly that Jethro himself offered the sacrifice but only that he "took" the sacrifice.

Third: Jethro's first mention of Yahweh is after the exodus and after he is told of these events by Moses.

Fourth: Jethro is not called a priest of Yahweh but a priest of Midian. The Midianites were regarded as an idolatrous people (Num. 25, 31). There is no evidence that the Midianites worshipped Yahweh.

Other arguments could be brought to bear which would demonstrate the errors of this view, but the foregoing should suffice.

It may be asked at this point, why this verse is so important to the critics. As previously pointed out, the material found in the Pentateuch can, according to the liberal critics, be traced to four main source documents (J, E, D, P). Up to Exodus 6:3, P (by the critical analysis) is quite careful not to use the name Yahweh. The reason for this, it is claimed, is that P believed that the name was first revealed to Moses and therefore refrains from anachronisms by not using the name in the earlier Genesis narratives. Exodus 6:3 therefore is the reason for the anomaly in P's use of the divine names. The characteristic name for P is Elohim according to their analysis.

The primary basis of the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch, at least originally, was the use of different names of God in various passages. The critics of this school of thought assume that the employment of various names for God indicates the use of various documents in the compilation of the Pentateuch. There are other areas of study that are employed to support this theory, but it is only the use of Divine names that the writer is interested in at this point.

The critics of this school assume that writers of the original source documents never used any name other than was assigned to him or that was in accordance with his peculiar views. This assumption, in the opinion of the writer, is not the result of a careful study of the occurrence of Divine names, but an arbitrary assumption designed to support an untenable theory. If it could be proven that in just one case a writer used a name other than by habit, the theory would collapse.

Against this view we raise the following objections:

First: A careful exegesis of this verse will not support this view. A proper understanding of the idiom "to know the name Yahweh" reveals that a first occurrence of the name is not implied here. A more complete discussion of the exegesis of the verse will be presented later.

Second: If Exodus 6:3 were a reference to merely the name of God as a name only, the passage would prove equally that before this time Elohim was unknown as a name for Deity, and God should appear uniformly as El-Shaddai in Patriarchal history.

Some negative or liberal critics, in answer to this argument would remind us that Exodus 6:3 is the first time P used the name Yahweh. They argue that P was quite careful in his use of Yahweh in order to avoid anachronisms. J and E, however, were not so careful. The writer of this paper will show later, that these assumptions will not stand for at least two reasons. First, P does use the name Yahweh before Exodus 6:3 (Gen. 17:1, 21:1). The critics realizing this is a serious problem have concluded that these passages must have been changed by a redactor. This answer is not at all acceptable as will be shown later in this discussion. Second, the assertion that J and E are not careful as to their use of the Divine names is easily disproved by a careful study of the contexts in which these names appear.

Third: The early occurrence of the name in Genesis destroys this assumption.

a. The fact that Yahweh occurs in conjunction with Elohim in Genesis chapter two causes the critics considerable difficulty. How shall the documents be distinguished in this case?

b. There are passages in the book of Genesis where the name of Yahweh is introduced in a way which utterly precludes the supposition that it is used proleptically, or that it is anything but

a correct account of the incident and the actual term employed. For example the use of Yahweh in Genesis 15:7, where God clearly asserts, "...I am Yahweh..." or when Jacob on his death-bed declares "I have waited for thy salvation, Yahweh" (Genesis 49:18). A more striking passage than even these is found in Genesis chapter four. There Eve states, "...I have gotten a man with the help of Yahweh."

c. The use of the name Yahweh after the dispersion of tongues is frequent and vital to the significance of many passages. Genesis 22:14, 24:35, 40, 42, 48, 56, 24:50, 51, 26:22.

d. The name Yahweh is compounded with other names long before the time of Moses. For example the name appears in the name of the mother of Moses, Jochebed (Yôkebed) meaning "Yahweh is glorious" (Exodus 6:20, Numbers 26:59). Against this argument some have suggested that Moses changed her name. This, however, is but a futile attempt to discredit unmistakable evidence. That Moses would have done this, to say the least, is highly improbable. There are also some other names from ancient time which occur in the genealogies in I Chronicles (I Chron. 2:25, 7:8, 4:18; Ahijah, Abiah) that are compounded with Yahweh.

The occurrence of the name in the word "Moriah" (Hamōriāh cf. Genesis 22:14) suggests an early knowledge of the name.

Fourth: The idiom "to know a name" as it is used in the Old Testament will not permit the liberal understanding of Exodus 6:3. Consider the following example, noting the book in which the reference is found and the chronological setting: Isa. 52:5-6: verse six reads:

"Therefore people shall know my name: therefore they shall know in that day that I am he that doth speak; behold it is I." (cf. also Jer. 16:21)

Upon a careful reading of these texts, it is at once obvious that the higher critical view of the expression "to know the name of Yahweh" as it is found in Exodus 6:3 is not only misleading but incorrect. If they are correct, then these texts could mean the name was not actually known until Isaiah's and Jeremiah's time, but this on the other hand, would then be in conflict with the statement of Moses. The contradiction disappears when the proper view of the idiom is realized. For other examples of this expression compare II Chron. 6:33, Isa. 19:20-21, Ezek. 20:5,9, 39:6-7, Psa. 33:18.

Fifth: The higher critical method of analysis mutilates the Biblical text, and beside that, it is not a consistent theory. That this theory mutilates the text is proven by the analysis of Genesis 28:19-29 where writers give many alternate changes from E to J back and forth. That this theory is saturated with obvious contradictions in application is evidenced by the following facts:

a. The name "Yahweh" occurs in two passages of P before Ex. 6:3 (Gen. 17:1, 21:16). In both cases a redactor or copyist is invoked to provide the solution to this embarrassing occurrence.

b. As to E, the name "Yahweh" occurs in four passages (Gen. 15:1, 2, 22:11, 27:7b). In these cases as in the previous a redactor is employed.

c. J uses the term Elohim in many passages (Gen. 3:1,3,5, 4:25, 7:9, 9:27, 16:24). Once again redactors are employed to relieve the difficulty.

d. P contradicts J if the liberal critic's theory is maintained, for J states that God was worshipped by the name Yahweh even before the flood (Gen. 4:25), that He revealed Himself by that name to Abram (Gen. 15:7), while P declares in Ex. 6:3 that the name Yahweh was not known to the Patriarchs.

Sixth: The experience of literary men and the history of literature are here in open conflict with the pretensions of the critics. None of these scholars now claims to discover in the Pentateuch less than four main writers and a "redactor," while most of them require many more. This skill, it might be noted, is asserted in investigating a foreign and ancient tongue, with no outside documents for comparison, and no knowledge of the alleged writers. We therefore ask, what is the basis for these assumptions of the critics? The answer is not a careful, objective study of Biblical literature and language, but an arbitrary, biased presupposition that the religion of Israel is the natural product of evolutionary processes. The fact that there are so many divergent opinions among the critics is evidence that this analysis is not a system, but a scheme. A scheme in which there is an agreement on the end to be accomplished, and on the starting point, but the process is largely the application of individual and subjective notions.

Seventh: A serious logical fallacy is also to be discerned in the use of Divine names as it relates to the documentary analysis. It can be demonstrated that the higher critical method of documentation is to argue in a circle. Differences are first created and then arguments are based on them. Documents are distinguished on the basis of the use of Divine names and then their correspondences with certain assumed traits or characteristics are claimed as proof for the objective existence of these documents.

Eighth: The documentary analysis assumes that the varied use of the Divine names is usually an indication of authorship. The same argument is applied in respect to various literary differences. A more dependable and proven explanation for these phenomena is that different situations and subject matter called for both different literary styles and vocabulary.

Ninth: The constant appeal, by the critic, to a redactor is a strong evidence that the theory bears many fallacies and weaknesses. The redactor is called to serve in Genesis 2:4b, 3:24, 4:25, 7:9, 9:27, 17:1, 21:1b, 20:18, 28:21, 22:11, etc. Now, the writer should like to ask at this point, how is it to be determined what is and what is not the work of a redactor? If the Divine names are indications of source documents of the Pentateuch, then they must be dependably consistent at this point. If but one name has been changed by a so-called redactor, then how are we to know if the other names have not been changed? Or furthermore, how do we know, for example, that where a redactor is claimed to have changed Elohim to Yahweh in the E document that perhaps the text is correct and a very energetic redactor has not changed the other portion of the context? Perhaps the context was really the work of J and a redactor changed all the names of Yahweh to Elohim. The reader might argue at this point that the writer is arguing from conjecture. The writer would most quickly admit this and at the same time, would point out that the critics holding this theory must be charged with the same fallacy. They have no more objective

proof for their contentions that the passage was an E document in which a redactor changed a name to Yahweh than his contention that it was a J document which had the Divine name changed to Elohim.

B. Interrogative View: This view holds that the reading of the text is in the form of a question not a statement. It would have Exodus 6:3 read:

"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty: but by my name Yahweh was I not known to them?"

Two writers who find this view acceptable are Jamieson and Scott.

This view is not necessarily contrary to the writer's view, but it is not an easily supported view. The grammar may permit this view but a consideration of the movement of the general context does not easily support such a reading. Such a reading could have been more clearly indicated in the Hebrew if this reading were intended, but it is not. Finally, very few, if any translations have understood this to be the reading of the Hebrew text.

C. The Special Revelation View: The special revelation view contends that the name "Yahweh" was known to the Patriarchs but in a somewhat limited sense. They did not have a complete knowledge of many of the aspects of this name especially in its redemptive significance. Special redemptive aspects of the name were revealed and experienced in the days of Moses and in particular in the exodus from Egypt. This view is expressed clearly by Henry Cowles:

The meaning is, not that the name of Yahweh was never used by them or given of God to them: but that its special significance had not been manifested to them as He was now about to make it manifest.¹³

Others who hold this view or a similar form of it are Hastings, Patrick, Wordsworth, Keil, Raven, Wiener, Allis, Unger and Oehler.

In the light of all the evidence from the Biblical text, the writer considers this to be the proper view.

The arguments in support of this view are three-fold:

1. **Exegetical Argument:** In order to deal accurately with the text at hand, it is imperative that there be a clear understanding of the text as it reads in the Hebrew text. Many of the errors which have arisen in the interpretation of this verse could have been avoided if the language and the syntax of this text were more carefully considered. Since the first part of the text was dealt with under the consideration of the minor problem, the writer shall proceed to examine the last phrase of the text which translated literally reads: "and (in the capacity of) my name Yahweh I was not known to them."

In the first place it should be observed that the emphatic word of the sentence is Šemi ("my name") and is so considered because it is first in the Hebrew sentence. The fact that this word is

emphatic is not without important implications, for it will be shown that the Hebrew concept of a name is far more than just that of an identifying title. In the Old Testament there was a peculiar signification attached to the name.¹⁴

The name "Yahweh" is an important word not only to this text but to the whole Old Testament. The etymology of this word has been disputed by many men for many years. Some have attempted to connect it with the Arabic *hawā* which means to "blow" or "breathe." Others have traced the origin of this word to Egyptian, Phoenician and Canaanitish influences. Their arguments for this etymology are not convincing at all, especially since they are based upon the presupposition that the religion of Israel may be traced to natural origins as may the religions of the heathen nations.

As to the formation of the name Yahweh, it is agreed among most lexicographers and other writers on the subject that the term Yahweh, however it might be pointed, is the regularly formed Qal imperfect of the verb *Havah* (to be) an obsolete form of *Hayah*. This view is not shared by all authorities, however. Some would contend that the name is to be understood as a Hiphil imperfect.¹⁵ While this view is permissible grammatically, it is in conflict with Exodus 3:14 where the name is explained. There the form is clearly a Qal. When Moses asked the Lord what name he should use in identifying the "God of your fathers" (vs. 13), the Lord answered saying, *'ehyeh 'ešer 'ehyeh* "I am that I am." He also told them that *'ehyeh šlāhni 'alēkem* "I am has sent me unto you." The verb translated "I am" in both phrases is *'ehyeh*, which is the Qal imperfect first person singular of *hāyāh*. If *'ehyeh* therefore, is understood as the Qal imperfect first person singular from the verb *hāyāh* and is His name, it is also reasonable to regard Yahweh as it appears in Exodus 6:3 as coming from the same root and also the Qal stem. The latter form, of course, is the third person singular of that stem and is translated "He is." The only difference between the two names is, that the one is a verb in the first person, and the other is the same verb in the third person. The meaning of the one is "I am," and the meaning of the other is "He is."

Supporting the view that this stem is the Qal is Edward Mack who makes the following remark:

It is evident from the interpretative passages (Exodus 3:6) that the form is the future of the simple stem (Kal) and not future of the causative (Hiphil) stem in the sense of "giver of life" an idea not borne out by any of the occurrences of the word.¹⁶

The writer maintains therefore, that the translation "I am" or "He is" is the proper one in view of the fact that the Qal is used in these texts. But the case for this understanding does not rest here. The fact that the imperfect is used in connection with these verbs also supports this conclusion. The imperfect state of the Hebrew verb does not always have to designate future time as some have erroneously assumed. A careful examination of the scope of the imperfect state will reveal that it may have primary reference to present states or actions as well as future.¹⁷

By the expression "I am," Yahweh is to be understood as a God who is eternal and self-existent. If the Hiphil stem is understood in regard to His name, the meaning is somewhat lower. He then is regarded as the "first cause of all things" or "life-giver."

That the translation of the verb *'ehyeh* is properly "I am" is further substantiated by the rendering of the Septuagint. The first phrase of Exodus 3:14 reads *ego eimi ho on*. *Eimi* is a present active indicative and *on* is a present participle of the same verb, *eimi*. This phrase would be

literally translated "I am the one who is." The other occurrence of 'ehyeh is also translated with the present participle, on. If the translators had understood the imperfect state with future implications, they would have used the future tense, but such, apparently was not the case.

Another strong argument for the rendering "I am" is found in the translations and interpretation of the name Yahweh in the New Testament. There are three very clear instances where this name is given definite meaning. The first is found in Matthew 22:32. There we read:

"I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

The verb translated "I am" is eimi, a present active indicative. The same form is found in Mark: 12:26 which is a similar quotation of Exodus 3:6. The last instance of this phenomenon is seen in John 8:58. Here the Greek once again for "I am" is ego eimi.

It would seem, therefore, if the idea of the imperfect were "I will be" or "He will be," both the LXX and the Greek of the New Testament would have recognized it. But such is not the case, so the writer therefore contends for the rendering "I am" denoting the eternal, self-existence of Yahweh.

The next word of the phrase under consideration is a vital word, and it is this word that holds the key to the meaning and interpretation of the text under consideration. The word nôda'tî which appears in the text of the Hebrew Bible is a Niphal perfect, first person singular, from the verb yāda' "to know." The real problem, involved in this word, is to determine what is meant when it is used in the expression "to know a name." The liberal critics have maintained that to know the name is to be acquainted with the title. "To make known a name," to their way of thinking, is merely to present the name for the first time. This assumption, it will be shown, is not the case, and the fact is, that the uses of this idiom in the Old Testament furnish the clue to the solution of this whole problem. When the expressions "to know Yahweh" or to "know the name of Yahweh" are used in the Old Testament they carry more than the idea of just to be acquainted with the radicals yhwḥ. For example the verb yāda' is used five times in respect to Yahweh in the book of Exodus alone, and in every case it is quite obvious that it has reference to more than just an acquaintance with a name.¹⁸ In every case it suggests an experiential knowledge of both the person and power of Yahweh. In every case the knowledge of Yahweh is connected with some deed or act of Yahweh which in some way reveals both His person and power. In Exodus 16:12 Yahweh spoke to Moses saying "I have heard the murmurings of the children of Israel: speak unto them saying, at even ye shall be filled with bread; and ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God." It should be noted that first, in respect to time, this is considerably later than the account of Exodus 6:3. Is it to be assumed, therefore, on the basis of the liberal or negative understanding of the verb yāda', that the children of Israel still didn't know who Yahweh was? Secondly, that his knowledge involves more than just an acquaintance with a name, is proven by the fact that the knowledge of Yahweh was the result of a particular experience of provision by Yahweh. They were to know Yahweh in a special manner. They had already learned of Him as deliverer; now they would know Him as their provider.

The verb yāda' is not only used to convey the idea of knowledge of a thing, but knowledge as a result of specific experience. This seems to be the idea expressed in Ezekiel 25:14.¹⁹

If the reader is not convinced at this point of this use of the verb yāda', there are several more uses of this verb that most clearly demonstrate that its meaning goes far beyond a mere knowledge of facts. This verb is also used for knowledge when both revelation and experience are involved. It is in this sense that the writer feels it is to be understood in the text under question, and to give evidence to this assertion he will present several cases for consideration. First, Jer. 28:9:

"The prophet that prophesieth of peace, when the word of the prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known, that Jehovah hath truly sent him."

According to this text a prophet was really "known" as the man sent from God when his words were fulfilled. This is the sense of Exodus 6:3, Yahweh was to be "known" or "made known" as He manifested and revealed Himself in the special acts of deliverance. The writer should also like to point out that here the verb form used in Jer. 28:9 is yiūada' the niphil imperfect third person singular masc. of the verb yāda'. It is interesting to note, that the stem used in Exodus 6:3 is also the niphil. It would seem, therefore, that this form, when used, carried more than a superficial knowledge of a thing. It conveyed the idea of knowledge as a result of revelation experience.

Other examples of this idea may be found in Prov. 10:9, Ex. 32:12-17, I Sam. 3:7, Jer. 16:21.

In this exegetical argument, the writer has endeavored to establish the following facts: First, the name Yahweh is the Qal imperfect of the verb hāyāh and denotes the eternal, unchanging character of God as evidenced by its use in Exodus 3:14. Second, the verb nōda' tî used in Exodus 6:3 must mean more than being acquainted with a title as such. Third, the fact that the niphil form is used in Exodus 6:3 strongly suggests knowledge in respect to revelation and experience. Fourth, the idiom "to know Yahweh" or "to know the name of Yahweh" as it is used in the Old Testament, generally signifies knowledge of some particular act or attribute of Yahweh as it is revealed in His dealing with men.

2. Theological Argument: The writer considers Exodus 6:3 to be a positive declaration of the fact that in the past the character of God has been revealed in His names, El-Shaddai, Elohim and Yahweh. But now He is going to reveal Himself further as Yahweh in a special way through revelation and the experience of deliverance. He is going to provide a demonstration of the fact that He is not only Yahweh who made a covenant with Abraham but is Yahweh who is faithful in keeping it. New aspects of His glory, majesty and redemption are to be known by Israel. The great redemptive power of Yahweh was now going to be known in various aspects as it had not been known before. The deliverance from Egyptian bondage is often referred to as the great illustration of this redemptive power in both the Old and New Testaments.

The following arguments are presented in support of this view: First, it is clear from Exodus chapter three that the name "Yahweh" was well established in the minds of the Israelites, for if

this were not the case, why would God tell Moses to tell the people of Israel if they should ask in whose name he comes, that "I am hath sent me unto you" (Ex. 3:14) or "Yahweh, the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you..." Did it not occur to either Moses or the Lord that the people might say, "Who is Yahweh?" But there is no problem in this respect. The silence of the Scriptures speak clearly to the fact that no such problem would arise because they know the name of the God of their fathers.

Second, the simple reading of Exodus 6:3 supports the view that a new revelation is meant, not that the name was not known. The text literally reads:

"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as (or in the capacity of) El-Shaddai but (in the capacity of) my name Yahweh, I was not known to them."

It should be remembered that the verb for "known" is nôda'^{fi} a niphil perfect, first person singular of the verb yāda' ("to know"). If the text meant to say that the name, as such, was not known, the third person singular would have been employed. It was in "the capacity of" the name Yahweh that He was to further reveal Himself.

Third, Exodus 6:3 is not a contrast between the use of Divine names. The name Elohim is not even mentioned in this verse. The text is a comparison of ideas which the names represent. It is a comparison between what has been revealed by Yahweh and what is about to be revealed. The character of Yahweh that is considered in the text as it relates to His name.

Fourth, it can be shown that the use of Divine names in the Pentateuch, in most cases at least, is obviously deliberate. For example it may be generally noted that when the power, majesty and faithfulness of God are in view Elohim is generally used. (Gen. 1, 6-9, etc.) But when the writer is writing in respect to salvation and the covenant relationship of God with Israel, Yahweh is generally used (Gen. 3:9-15, 4:1, 26, 8:20, etc.).²⁰

Fifth, that the name Yahweh could have been known and used by the Patriarchs not knowing its full significance and implications is proven possible from every day occurrences. It is possible for a man to bear the name of a certain office before he fulfills any of its functions. President, magistrate, and policeman are titles which may be borne by several persons to whom they legally belong, before any of the acts peculiar to those offices are performed. The president as acknowledged on his inauguration is known to be such by his administrative acts, the magistrate by his administration of justice and the policeman by the apprehending of criminals.

In the preceding arguments the writer has endeavored to show: 1. That the reading of Exodus 6:3 clearly reveals that a special revelation in relation to the nature and character of Yahweh is under consideration. 2. That Exodus 6:3 is not a contrast between the use or occurrence of Divine names but a comparison of the ideas which El-Shaddai and Yahweh represent. 3. That the use of Divine names in the Pentateuch is in most cases deliberate. 4. That the name of Yahweh has a peculiar redemptive significance in the Pentateuch and is generally used in this sense. 5. That practical experience indicates the possibility of knowing a name or title without having a complete knowledge of all the functions and attributes of that title.

3. Contextual Argument: The contextual argument simply consists of an examination of the immediate context to see if the interpretation suggested by the writer fits in logically and naturally.

It should be observed, first of all, that the children of Israel are, in this book, at a very unique stage of their history. From the moment of their departure, they will be recognized as a nation in the true sense of the term. It is in this capacity, i.e. as a nation, that Yahweh is going to deal with them. It is Yahweh's intention to reveal Himself as He had never done so before. This covenant-making God was about to demonstrate both His power and faithfulness in the redemption of Israel (cf. Ex. 3:8-12, 15-22). In the immediate context of Exodus 6:3 we find the sense in which Yahweh was to reveal Himself to Israel. Exodus 6:4 restates the covenant made with Israel. Verses six to eight presents the plan of Yahweh for the nation of Israel. Verse six clearly promises redemption from bondage. Verse seven states Yahweh's purpose in His redeeming the children of Israel. This verse is very important in our consideration for it clearly explains the latter phrase of Exodus 6:3. We have already suggested that there was a particular sense in which Yahweh had not revealed Himself to the children of Israel. That aspect, or part of revelation is explained in this verse. Notice the reading of this verse:

"And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians."

There are two basic assertions in this verse. First, Yahweh declares the election of the children of Israel as a people for His name. Secondly, He states that they shall know Him, not for the first time, but as the one "who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians." This means they would "know Yahweh as their redeemer and deliverer." The whole message of the book of Exodus is centered around this theme (cf. Exodus 7:5, 17, 8:23, 10:3, 12:12-13, 14:13ff, 15:2ff). This revelation and experience was a mountain peak in Israel's history. Whenever Israel slips away from fellowship with Yahweh, as in Micah 6, Yahweh reminds them of this deliverance from Egypt.

"For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of bondage..." (Micah 6:4)

In the eighth verse of Exodus, chapter six, Yahweh restates His promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and promises its fulfillment. The basis for this promise is "I am Yahweh."

It is the conclusion of the writer that the immediate context of Exodus 6:3 and the greater context of the book reveal the fact that before this time, the children of Israel had not known all that was involved in the covenant name "Yahweh." Only in these particular circumstances could the truth of the redemptive power of Yahweh be revealed.

English Paraphrase

And I revealed myself unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob in the capacity of the God Almighty, but in the full redemptive significance of my name Yahweh, I was not made known (revealed) unto them.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Cf. Martin Noth. The History of Israel. (Harper & Brothers).
2. William F. Albright. From the Stone Age to Christianity. (The Johns Hopkins press) p. 180 ff.
3. Bernhard W. Anderson. Understanding the Old Testament. (Prentice Hall Inc.) p. 23.
4. Gustave Friedrich Oehler. Theology of the Old Testament. (Zondervan Publishing House) p. 90.
5. Edward Mack. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. (The Howard Severance Co.) pp. 1266, 1267.
6. John Calvin. Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses. (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.) Vol. I, p. 126.
7. C.I. Scofield (Editor) The Scofield Reference Bible. (Oxford University Press) p. 26.
8. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) pp. 906-907.
9. Ibid. p. 908.
10. William Gesenius. (Translated by Edward Robinson) A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. (Cocher and Brewster) p. 1036.
11. John Edgar Mc Fadyen. Introduction to the Old Testament. (Hodder and Stoughton) p. 22.
12. Karl Budde. Religion of Israel to the Exile. (G.P. Putnam's Sons) p. 19.
13. Henry Cowles. Butler's Bible-Work. (Funk & Wagnalls) p. 598.
14. Oswald T. Allis. The Five Books of Moses. (The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.) p. 28. Compare also: E.J. Young. An Introduction to the Old Testament. (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.) p. 136.
15. Gustave Friedrich Oehler. op. cit. pp. 95, 96.
16. Edward Mack. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. P. 1266.
17. Kautzsch, E. (ed) Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. 2d. Eng. ed. of 28th Ger. ed. Trans. A.E. Conley. (Oxford: University Press) p. 313.
18. Exodus 6:7, 10:2, 14:4, 16:12, 29:46.
19. Cf. also Josh. 23:14, Isa. 9:8, Psa. 14:4, Ezek. 20:9, Hosea 9:7.
20. Oehler. op. cit. Pp. 98, 99.

GENERAL REVIEW

Events Viewed in the Light of God's Word

HERMAN A. HOYT
President, Grace Theological Seminary

This is a period of peril in the history of the world. All civilization is being threatened. Never before in its history has anything been known on such colossal proportions. It is impossible to glance anywhere at the communications of men without recognizing that men are more or less aware of the gigantic dimensions of this moving avalanche of destruction. Some word of comment concerning world affairs appears in almost every telecast, broadcast, newspaper, magazine, sermon, or address, religious or secular. Some comments aim at diagnosis, others at solution, and yet others at removing the gloom and despair. But one cannot help but detect confusion in most of them. Men are groping in darkness in their attempts to grasp the meaning of the total picture. And this is just as true of men who stand high in position in the intellectual and political levels of the world as it is of men who belong to the lesser known classes.

Arnold J. Toynbee, eminent British historian, in a recent volume from his pen, America and the World Revolution and Other Lectures, comments on current world affairs. From the viewpoint of a historian and prophet, he offers another and more complete analysis of the present discontents, along with possible solutions, and prophetic forecasts. According to Toynbee, the American Revolution initiated a world movement for human rights. But now America is a counter-revolutionary power hostile to revolution such as that demonstrated among Bolsheviks because Communism threatens the wealth of this land. The place of idealism once occupied by the United States is now the position of the Soviet Union. Forsaking materialism is the only way America can rejoin the noble revolution she once spearheaded. When Mr. Toynbee dares to suggest that Judaism and Christianity are the parent religion for Communism in its crusades for social justice it is apparent that he too is confused theologically and historically.

With clear perception, Mr. Toynbee does predict the awful possibility of atomic genocide, from which ultimate peril not even the Soviet Union, the United States of America, or Christianity as it exists today can deliver us. Having eliminated the above sources for solution, this brilliant historian and philosopher suggests that the last best hope lies in a new world-state such as those that rescued past civilizations from destruction. He recognizes what others are seeing with equal clarity that nuclear war may start "at any moment by accident, miscalculation, or madness" as declared by President Kennedy to the United Nations in 1961, and dramatized by the recent Cuban crisis. For this reason every effort should be expended to discover the architect of a new world-state. Whatever the origin of this new Augustus or Liu P'ang, and he may well be a Hindu or Buddhist from a neutral Asiatic nation, the nations should be ready to submit to his dictates, however distasteful, when he appears.

The hopes and fears of Mr. Toynbee are familiar to the student of Biblical prophecy. Nor are these ideas necessarily original with him. He is merely formulating verbally the vague and indistinct ideas of men who imagine that hope is to be found on the purely human and earthly level. In fact, the solution proposed by Mr. Toynbee is the fruit of the pattern of thinking now moving to high tide in intellectual circles and which will eventually permeate the thinking of the peoples of the earth. In substance it is this, namely, the exaltation of humanism and the exclusion of deity

in the thinking of men. The exclusion of the supernatural in their thinking leaves men with the level of the natural as the sum total of reality. Within this realm there must be varying degrees from the lowest to the highest, and this last will eventually be crowned with sovereignty and declared to be deity. It is this last to which Mr. Toynbee is making reference and is known to students of predictive prophecy as the final world empire ruled by the Antichrist of the endtime.

The world is moving swiftly toward the ushering in of one final world empire. This was predicted in Daniel (2, 7) and repeated in Revelation (13). Through the centuries there have been tokens. The thinking of men moved in this direction at Babel (Gen. 11:1-11). The march of empire from Babylon to Rome is over this pattern. Rome, the final world empire, has continued in some form through the centuries of the Christian era. The alliances, world court, disarmament conferences, League of Nations, and now the United Nations are all over this pattern of thinking, that at last the one satisfactory solution to the problems of the multiplicity of nations is a United Nations of the World, one great empire embracing all mankind. The peril of this plan lies in the fact that it is supposed by men that this can be accomplished alone by unaided and sinful humanity. It is being declared that "it is technologically possible for humanity to build a world of security, plenty, and justice. It is such a world that wise and well-governed states must seek; and this is the central task of the United Nations." But another observes that "we live in an imperfect world perfectly equipped for self-destruction, and the United Nations is an imperfect instrument in protecting us from this." Still another agrees that "we are almost certainly heading for a series of international crises, and one of which can be worse than the one before it. We must school our nerves and hearts for whatever is to come. We must prepare ourselves to live with deep trouble, and to live with frustration, and to live with despair. If we do that well enough, we cannot be defeated finally."

All of this adds up to one thing, namely, the determination of men to face the future with all of its horrors in the energy of the flesh and on the earthly level. This means that there will eventually be a United Nations of the World which will embrace all mankind, and it will be the fulfillment of the prophecies of the Bible. As suggested by Toynbee, the architect of this superstate will be a great man, a Caesar of the endtime with stature that will command the admiration and allegiance of mankind. The Bible declares he will be a man of peace and religion riding into prominence on a white horse (Rev. 6:1-2). He will also be a military genius, defying even death itself (Rev. 13:3-4). He shall be a man of high intelligence, great learning, a philosopher, and a statesman (Dan. 7:8; 8:23-25). But in addition to all this, he shall be a proud man (Dan. 8:25), who exalts himself above God and all that is called God (2 Thess. 2:3-4), and at last offers himself to Satan as his man (Rev. 13:1-2).

There is no doubt what the response of the millions of mankind will be. They will welcome him. They will submit to him. They will worship him (Rev. 13:3-4). Under his leadership the superstate will have been realized, and under the power of a strong delusion the multitudes will become the dupes of this despot (2Thess. 2:11). But it will all be one great falsification of grandeur. At that moment, when all mankind is united in one empire under one supreme emperor, and at last the utopian dreams of humanity appear to have been realized, the fruit of his reign will appear. Universal war will spread across the world (Rev. 6:3-4); famine will take its deadly toll (Rev. 6:5-6); and death from multiple sources will follow swiftly (Rev. 6:7-8). His reign will end

in a holocaust of war such as the world has never known (Rev. 16:12-16; 19:19-21), bringing this final empire to a swift and dreadful termination (Rev. 18). This is the sincere but unknowing proposal of Mr. Toynbee and thousands like him.

The genuine fulfillment of the dreams of men will come, but not in the way nor direction being proposed. The architect of this final and everlasting kingdom is the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords (Rev. 19:16). With catastrophic demonstration "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (Dan. 2:44). Like a stone cut out of a mountain without hands, shall it fall upon the united kingdoms of sinful men in this last fateful hour and destroy them, and this stone shall become a great mountain and fill the whole earth (Dan. 2:34-35, 45). Then "the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him," and "shall... sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations" (Matt. 25:31-32).

BOOK REVIEWS

VAN TIL. By Rousas J. Rushdoony. Modern Thinkers Series. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. 51 pp., \$1.25.

The author, who is pastor of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Santa Cruz, California, draws much of his material from a book of his entitled By What Standard, an analysis of the philosophy of Cornelius Van Til. He includes a good bibliography of the various writings of Van Til.

He begins by showing that modern philosophy is actually a flight from reality. The current philosophical demand is for rootlessness, subjectivity, and relativism. "Reality" is very limited if permitted at all. The standard practice is to ignore orthodox Christianity. The last of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th saw the Reformation principles restored to philosophy in the person of Abraham Kuyper. In his tradition today the two central figures in Europe are Vollenhoven and Dooyeweerd, and in America, Van Til.

The author likens Van Til and his impact on philosophy to the old tale of "The Emperor's Clothes." Autonomous man has long been the emperor in every avenue of human thought. In the realms of philosophy and apologetics many see an area of knowledge that can be comprehended by the consistent natural man; an area of "neutral facts" which are available to God and man and which derive meaning from themselves. In the light of the biblical doctrines of total depravity, the self-contained Trinity, etc., Van Til insists that man cannot know anything apart from God; that every fact is a God-created and God-interpreted fact that can be known only as we think God's thoughts after Him. The emperor has no clothes. The natural man thus can have no valid knowledge of his own and what he has is borrowed from Christian theism. He is epistemologically naked.

In some systems the autonomy of theoretical thought is assumed for apologetic purposes. According to Van Til this cannot be done because

natural man is not able to judge reality nor is he impartial and neutral concerning the God whom, because of depravity, he despises. For Van Til there is no factuality or meaning apart from God. Therefore only theistic facts are possible and we must reason from God to God-given and God-interpreted facts. This is impossible for the autonomous mind.

The history of philosophy is briefly reviewed and criticized. The author contends that Van Til is one contemporary thinker, as perhaps no other, who is well known and little read. He concludes with the observation that "because Van Til brings to such clear focus the issues between Christianity and anti-theism, his philosophy constitutes a stone of stumbling and rock of offense...to those whose philosophic concern is to break down the offense of Christianity to the natural man."

ROLLAND McCUNE

Winona Lake, Indiana

THE BIBLE COLLEGE STORY: EDUCATION WITH DIMENSION. By S. A. Witmer. Channel Press, Inc., Manhasset, New York, 1962. 253 pp., \$3.75.

Although there are now 250 Bible colleges in North America with a total of over 25,000 students, this is the first volume to authoritatively tell "The Bible College Story." The work is a smoothly written, thorough analysis of the history, present situation, and future of the Bible Institute-College movement.

The author, as executive secretary of the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges, has a competent knowledge of the issues with which the book deals. He deals fairly with the problems as well as the glories of the schools about which he writes. As a former Bible college president holding the Ph. D. degree in education and psychology, Dr. Witmer speaks as an expert on the subject of Christian higher education.

The incisive style of the book offers better than average reading for the student, pastor, teacher, layman, and others who should be aware of the existence and purpose of these schools. Several of the chapters deal with matters relevant to any aspect of Christian higher education as well as Bible colleges. The chapter on "Biblicentric Education," for example, lucidly presents the case for the basis of all truly evangelical education--the Word of God. The chapters on "Field Work: Service in Training" and "Teaching the Bible" contain extremely important considerations for all those who are interested in the work of Christian colleges and seminaries. There are ten tables in the book presenting various statistical data relative to the subject. The list of "Bible Institutes and Bible Colleges of the United States and Canada" is probably the most exhaustive compilation of its kind to be found anywhere.

Education with Dimension fills a long standing need in evangelical literature by informing the world of the import of Bible education in the twentieth century.

KENNETH O. GANGEL

Calvary Bible College

PENTECOST AND MISSIONS. By Harry R. Boer. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1961. 270 pp., \$5.00.

This book appeared originally in 1955 as a doctoral dissertation under the extended title Pentecost and the Missionary Witness of the Church, written for the Department of Missions of the Free University of Amsterdam. In its present form it has been altered somewhat to give it a more popular appeal.

The burden of the book is to present the significance of Pentecost in relation to the missionary enterprise. The writer was impressed with the seeming lack of attention given to this aspect of missionary endeavor by authors of treatises on missions. He claims that the experience of Pent-

ecost has often been studied in relation to "speaking with other tongues." It has been considered in its connection with the birth of the church and the salvation of men but for some reason the Acts 2 event has not been given the consideration it deserves in relation to the missionary witness of the church. Dr. Boer seeks to address himself to this emphasis in his book.

In the course of the volume he endeavors to show that it is not the Great Commission that gives motive power to missionary endeavor. The latter derives its power and meaning wholly and exclusively from the outpouring of Pentecost. This is not to devalue the importance of the Great Commission. It has played a powerful role in the missionary witness of the church from the day of Pentecost to the present. But it took the effusion of Pentecost to make it effective. It alone gave the dynamic to impel the church to obey it. Dr. Boer's basic argument is that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of life, of witness, of power, of unity, and of love and thus without Him proper motivation is impossible.

Dr. Boer, himself a missionary of the Christian Reformed Church of the United States in Northern Nigeria, has made extensive use of Scripture to establish his viewpoint. His work is an earnest endeavor to emphasize the importance of recognizing the work of the Holy Spirit in all missionary endeavor. As such the work deserves careful consideration.

Some who read the book, including the writer of this review, will doubtless take issue with or question some of the viewpoints of the author, such as his ideas on family salvation (Chapter 8, pp. 164-185), the matter of ecumenicity (Chapter 9), and some of his eschatological viewpoints. But by the exercise of discrimination the reader may derive much blessing by reading this book.

HOMER A. KENT, SR.

Grace Theological Seminary



GRACE JOURNAL

A PUBLICATION OF GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Winona Lake, Indiana

SPRING 1963

Vol. 4

No. 2

GRACE JOURNAL

A publication of Grace Theological Seminary

VOLUME 4

SPRING, 1963

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

THE MEANING OF BIBLICAL HISTORY	William R. Foster	3
BIBLICAL CATASTROPHISM AND GEOLOGY	Henry M. Morris	9
THE LOGOS CONCEPT	Edgar J. Lovelady	15
THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE ANTICHRIST	Herman A. Hoyt	25
BOOK REVIEWS		35
BOOKS RECEIVED		47

GRACE JOURNAL is published three times each year (Winter, Spring, Fall) by Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana.

EDITORIAL POLICY: The editors of GRACE JOURNAL hold the historic Christian faith, and accept without reservation the inerrancy of Scripture and the premillennial view of eschatology. A more complete expression of their theological position may be found in the Statement of Faith of Grace Theological Seminary. The editors, however, do not necessarily endorse every opinion that may be expressed by individual writers in the JOURNAL.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.00 per calendar year; single copy, 75c.

ADDRESS: All subscriptions and review copies of books should be sent to GRACE JOURNAL, Box 397, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Copyright, 1963, by Grace Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOMER A. KENT, JR.

Editor

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.

Managing Editor

HERMAN A. HOYT

General Review Editor

S. HERBERT BESS

Book Review Editor

JAMES L. BOYER

E. WILLIAM MALE

KENNETH G. MOELLER

Business Committee

ALVA J. McCLAIN

HOMER A. KENT, SR.

JOHN REA

Consulting Editors

THE MEANING OF BIBLICAL HISTORY

WILLIAM R. FOSTER

Dean of Faculty

London College of Bible and Missions

The study of history as an intellectual discipline requires far more than a mere assembling of facts. The interpretation of history must be recognized as a legitimate and necessary aspect of the historian's task since facts in themselves have no abiding value apart from the consideration of their causes and consequences. Nor would it be possible for a historian to collect all the facts of history—a circumstance which demands a guide to the selection of the facts deemed significant. "A failure or refusal to acknowledge and deal explicitly with its philosophical implications really means that a philosophy functions surreptitiously, and that it is likely to be only by a happy accident adequate and relevant to the facts of history."¹ In the consideration of the Biblical record as history two distinct areas must be investigated. In the first place, the question of the relation of the recorded events to the actual facts of history must be considered. Are we dealing in the Scriptures with legendary story (saga), or do the recorded events actually take place in history? In the second place, the pattern of these Biblical events must be discovered since it is clearly evident that the authors of the Bible did not include all the historical details which were available (John 21:25). In the past centuries especially since the Reformation the Scriptures have been subjected to critical attack centering upon the question of their historicity.

The Older Form of Literary Criticism

The course of criticism has not always run in the same channels, and, therefore, cannot be explained by general covering statements. The past thirty years have witnessed a most striking reversal of critical opinion from that which reached its climax toward the close of the last century. The roots of this older form of criticism may be traced backward to the rationalism of the 18th century. Voltaire and Condorcet argued that "history was the story of man's progress from ignorance and superstition to the clear day of rationality through which he would eventually reach perfection."² The development of scientific historiography in the following century produced a confidence "in the efficacy of the new historical method to discover the truth of history, and so the meaning of history itself."³ The development of the evolutionary concept in the same century was regarded as providing the capstone of fully scientific naturalistic humanism. "Divine intervention ...was declared to be impossible, because of history's very nature. The divine would only enter in at the end, and would then turn out to be man himself."⁴

Naturalistic humanism exercised a large measure of control over the spirit, method, and conclusions of religious scholars who delighted to be known for their "open-minded investigation of the facts, without any prior assumptions or commitments."⁵ Theological liberalism could not be completely naturalistic or fully humanistic, and maintain its connection with theology. This tension was overcome by the religious philosophy of Schleiermacher who propounded the doctrine of divine immanence which made man akin to the infinite and impersonal World-Spirit. In its fullest development of the humanistic doctrine of man theological liberalism "advocated a romantically light view of his sinfulness...represented him as the highest evolutionary achievement of an immanent divine principle...enthusiastically pictured him as on the verge of realizing, by his own

efforts, an idealistic program of social amelioration, which was identified with the kingdom of God...insisted that he had only recently evolved by natural processes from a purely animal stage."⁶ This composite of ideas established the atmosphere of rosy optimism which provided the theological climate of the beginning of the twentieth century.

The critical study of the 19th century subjected the Scriptures to the same foundational principles which had given rise to theological liberalism. Rationalism could not remain satisfied until the supernatural elements in the history and religion had been reduced to the level of the natural world. Ingenious explanations of the Biblical miracles were attempted, or reduced as did Harnack "to the misconceived and unexplained." Historians adopted the scientific method in order to re-fashion history as a science, and began the labor of sifting the facts of the past in order to find out, as Leopold von Ranke stated, "how it actually happened." The result in the realm of Biblical studies was the fostering of a skeptical attitude toward the historicity of Biblical events. Their error was not so much in their method as in the hasty and unjustified conclusions which were drawn from their investigations. The evolutionary hypothesis became the foundational philosophical principle to establish the meaning of history. This resulted in a drastic rearrangement of the structure of Scripture to support the developmental hypothesis. "The course of man's development in the realm of religion...began with the tribal god and primitive faith of early Israel, its culmination in the teachings of Jesus."⁷ The rejection of doctrine as relevant to the religious life was inherited from Schleiermacher, and was directed toward the undermining of the orthodox Biblical teachings. Doctrinal foundations disappeared because they were regarded as divisive and antagonistic to the well-integrated religious life.

This form of criticism did not adequately deal with the problem of history, and began to break down as a system shortly after the beginning of the 20th century. Its skepticism concerning the historicity of Biblical events involved a basic disagreement with the Christian Lord and Master (Matt. 12:39-42), with the historian Luke (Luke 1:1-4), with the apologist Stephen (Acts 7:2-50), and with the missionary Paul (Acts 13:16-39). This disagreement became more uncomfortable when the developing science of archaeology began to show that Biblical history is far more reliable than any of the critics had ever expected. Archaeology has "in general supported the position of those who regard the Bible as trustworthy."⁸ Criticism's most disastrous error was uncovered in its attempt to make the interpretive principle regulate the historical facts of the Biblical record rather than to allow the pattern of interpretation to be derived from the facts contained in the Scriptures. "Straight-line evolution was a framework imposed on the Bible from without, and it has proved far too rigid to accommodate the data."⁹ The idea of automatic progress has become doubtful due to the shattering of liberal optimism by two world wars in one generation. One contemporary exponent of liberalism now admits that "a thousand years from now our descendants will be facing difficult times, some of their problems being new and others being the same old problems that plague us today, because they will share inevitably in the perennial human predicament."¹⁰ The very nature of history is now being called into question in order to discover some philosophy of history which will more adequately explain the course of events. History is a mystery, and "the cosmos is more mysterious today than ever it was."¹¹ The older form of criticism has no solution to this mystery, and its once confident interpretation of history is being more and more recognized as totally inadequate. In a system where chance is the only ultimate principle of evolution, history can hardly be expected to have any pattern of purpose.

The Newer Form of Higher Criticism

The attitude of criticism has greatly changed in the past three decades as the older critical views toppled more and more into discard. The doctrine of human perfectibility is no longer so confidently held. The stress upon man's ability must be replaced by an emphasis upon the grace of God. One historian decries the naivete of those who conceive of man as an evolving and perfectible creature by asserting that "it is essential not to have faith in human nature. Such faith is a recent heresy and a very disastrous one."¹² The evil potential in man is now more candidly recognized, and so an emphasis upon the sinfulness of man is replacing the rosy optimism of yesteryear. There is a growing sense of the inadequacy "of any explanation which attempts to interpret history, simply from history. History may be known only by One who is beyond its movement."¹³ Therefore, God is being understood more in the sense of His transcendence than His immanence. Revelation is replacing reason as the means by which man understands the significance of history and existence. Older liberalism had its hope in a Utopia which involved a perfect social order which man would build upon the earth. Now contemporary representatives of liberalism believe that "every hope for the establishment of God's kingdom within history is incomplete and imperfect."¹⁴ The kingdom of God is presented as an eschatological concept, not as that which will take place at the end of history, but as that which lies beyond history. "The meaning in history lies always in the present, and when... conceived as the eschatological present by Christian faith the meaning in history is realized."¹⁵ The meaning of history comes from beyond history through the revelational encounter with God in which the events of the contemporary world take on new meaning and significance. Since the Scriptures "mirror the experienced history of Israel"¹⁶, the narratives contained therein portray "the deepest dimensions of Israel's history--her encounter with Yahweh in the political and cultural crisis of the time."¹⁷ The new emphasis in Biblical studies is now directed toward the discovery of the underlying themes and concepts which constituted Israel's religious heritage, rather than toward the atomizing of Israel's religious documents into fragmentary sources, and the piecing of the sources into a presupposed evolutionary pattern.

Contemporary criticism has designated the two components of historical study by two German words which are in non-technical usage normally synonymous. The assured or established facts of history fall within the realm of historie which technically refers to a historical event occurring at a certain place, and on a certain day which can be historically verified by competent investigators. Geschichte refers to the supra-temporal or supra-historical realm, "the realm of faith or ...the realm of redemption."¹⁸ Critics usually avoid a flat negative answer to historical questions concerning the mighty acts of God, but in reality assume that the Biblical records do not fall in the area of historie but of geschichte. Geschichte involves the realm of meaning since in the common experiences of the Israelites they saw the hand of God in the events of their history. The Exodus was only a political event, the liberation of a band of slaves from Pharaoh's yoke. Externally this event had no uniqueness since it may be compared with similar events in the lives of other people. However, with the eyes of faith these Israelite slaves saw in this event the presence of God in redemption. In the Exodus, historie would relate only to the liberation of slaves from the Pharaoh's yoke, whereas geschichte would refer to the perception in these historical experiences of "a divine dimension of meaning of which the general public was unaware."¹⁹ The same author asserts that "no external historical study can demonstrate that the Exodus was an act of God."²⁰ The Exodus account does not purport to be "objective history," but is rather to be under-

stood as "an interpretive account of events...an interpretation of faith...a meaningful happening in the life of a people."²¹ The heart of the whole matter has been given by Wright in his definition of Biblical Theology as "a theology of recital or proclamation of the acts of God, together with the inferences drawn therefrom."²² These new views have fundamentally altered the course of critical opinions, but this mid-twentieth century interpretation of history does not constitute an orthodox or even valid understanding of the meaning of history.

The new criticism is open to two basic disagreements as it pertains to the orthodox understanding of history. In the first place, the actual facts of history seem to have no valid connection with the interpretation of history. Although the critics protest that Israel's faith is radically historical, this does not necessitate a close integration of fact and interpretation. The actual historical event is of no real importance, and is not under any circumstance to be regarded as unique or as accomplished by supernatural power. The revelation of divine activity is not to be found in the event on the plane of historie, but in the revelational encounter in the realm of geschichte. The cause and the consequence of the Exodus are in historie, the whim of Pharaoh and the liberty of the slaves; in geschichte, the power of God and the redemption of His people. This is a historical dualism which is contrary to the orthodox understanding of history. "If it is not too important whether or not the particular events happened as recorded, then the uniqueness predicated of them can hardly be what our fathers in the faith have meant by the uniqueness of redemptive history."²³

In the second place, the interpretation of these events depends upon "the inferences drawn therefrom"²⁴, and the ability of persons "who perceived in the events a divine dimension of meaning."²⁵ In the events of the Exodus the Israelites presumed to see the hand of God, and in their explanation of the meaning of the events to themselves they inferred that God had been present with them, and had brought them out of Egyptian bondage. As Edward J. Young argues so conclusively, "the all-important question is this, Was Israel's inference true to fact or was it not."²⁶ Does this imply that human inference is a valid means for the discovery of truth, or may human inference sometimes be a mistaken inference? The critic would answer that "God gives evidence of his presence and redemptive purpose, but in an ambiguous way that demands faith and trust."²⁷ However, this answer only intensifies the problem, since the possibility of a mistaken inference is now joined to an ambiguous revelational encounter, and the possibilities inherent in this combination leave the critic exactly where his older predecessor arrived--with no certain interpretation of history. Perhaps this is the reason why some moderns are willing to make the basic assumption that "we cannot know if there is a plan for history, nor even if there is, whether it can ever be realized."²⁸ Thus, modern criticism has no solution to the historical problem of the Bible since it cannot discover the facts underlying the record nor establish an interpretation which is certain.

The Orthodox Alternative to Critical Theories

To the orthodox Christian the Biblical record is founded squarely upon certain things that God did in history through the entrance of the supernatural into the affairs of men. The historicity of the Biblical record is the only position which is in harmony with the understanding of the apostolic church and the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself who unequivocally spoke of the great events of the Old Testament history as actual happenings (Matt. 11:21-24, 12:1-5, 12:39-42, 23:35). This position has been followed by orthodox theologians through the succeeding centuries so that an orthodox scholar of a preceding generation could state that "the centre and core of all the Bible

is history."²⁹ The general providential working of God in all the events of history is indeed a blessed reality (Eph. 1:11), but this is not precisely the sense in which the orthodox theologians assert that God was active in history. The Bible records the special and supernatural interventions of God into the course of human history. The Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt was not a providential working of God, but an event which was supernaturally accomplished, and in which God was specially manifested. This activity of God was not common to all peoples, but special to the one nation which He had chosen (Psa. 147:20). Through supernatural exhibitions of His power in redemption and judgment God constituted the history of Israel to be unique as compared to the history of all other nations. These supernatural manifestations were climaxed in the assuming of an incarnate form in Jesus Christ, who being true God and true man, was crucified in history, was resurrected after three days in the tomb, is ascended into heaven from which place He shall physically return into the realm of human history.

Nor does the interpretation of these facts of history rest upon the human religious consciousness, for the mighty acts of God in history are interpreted by certain divinely-prepared witnesses who speak as directed by God and write as moved by God (2 Peter 1:21 ASV). The Exodus is not an experience common to all enslaved people, but a unique divine deliverance of a specially chosen people at a particular time from a specific place. The Biblical record of the Exodus is a divinely-inspired interpretation of the significance of the event given through the prophetic ministry of Moses. The historical events of the Exodus were revelatory of God's power, but such revelations cannot be properly understood unless it also be accompanied by a revelation in words. The Israelite did indeed see the manifestations of God's glory and power, but they were not left to draw their own inferences from these events. This interpretation of events does not come as "an ambiguous revelational encounter," but as a clear unveiling to the chosen prophet of the precise significance of the event. Supernatural ability is granted to the prophet to communicate accurately the truth to his people, or to record the interpretation in a permanent form for future generations. The orthodox concept of revelation is the key to a satisfactory solution to the problem of history. If God led the children of Israel out of Egypt, "we today can know that fact only if He Himself has told us."³⁰ Our understanding of the significance of redemptive history is not based upon inference from events, but rests upon the certain truth revealed by One who is beyond history, who acts in history, and who sees the end of history from its beginning.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Andrew K. Rule, "Interpretation of History," 20th Century Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, I, 515.
2. W. Stanford Reid, "Review of Current Religious Thought," Christianity Today, Feb. 3, 1958, p. 40.
3. Loc. cit.
4. Loc. cit.
5. Andrew K. Rule, "Liberalism," 20th Century Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, II, 660.
6. Ibid., p. 661.
7. John Bright, The Kingdom of God, p. 9.
8. Edward J. Young, Old Testament Theology Today, p. 11.
9. John Bright, op. cit., p. 10.
10. Elton Trueblood, Predicament of Modern Man, p. 7.

11. Herbert Butterfield, Christianity and History, p. 118.
12. Ibid., p. 47.
13. W. Stanford Reid, op. cit., p. 40.
14. Robert Paul Lightner, Neo-liberalism, pp. 85-86.
15. R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History, p. 155.
16. Bernhard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, p. 205.
17. Loc. cit.
18. Edward J. Young, op. cit., p. 19.
19. Bernhard W. Anderson, op. cit., p. 15.
20. Loc. cit.
21. Ibid., p. 14.
22. G. Ernest Wright, God Who Acts, p. 11.
23. Meredith G. Kline, Review of Bernhard W. Anderson, "Understanding the Old Testament," Westminster Theological Journal, May, 1959, p. 253.
24. G. Ernest Wright, op. cit., p. 11.
25. Bernhard Anderson, op. cit., p. 13.
26. Edward J. Young, op. cit., p. 23.
27. Bernhard Anderson, op. cit., p. 44.
28. W. Stanford Reid, op. cit., p. 40.
29. J. Gresham Machen, "History and Faith," The Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XIII, July, 1915.
30. Edward J. Young, op. cit., p. 25.

BIBLICAL CATASTROPHISM AND GEOLOGY

HENRY M. MORRIS
Professor of Civil Engineering
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Theories of catastrophism in geological interpretation are not new. Prior to the time of Sir Charles Lyell, scientists generally believed that most geological formations must be attributed to great physical catastrophes or revolutions. Lyell, however, taught that these phenomena could be explained by the ordinary processes of nature, acting over vast expanses of geological time. This is his "principle of uniformitarianism," now almost universally accepted as the foundation principle of modern historical geology.

Profoundly influenced by Lyell's theories, Charles Darwin soon published his theory of evolution by natural selection. The supposed paleontological record of the evolutionary history of life on earth, together with the principle of uniformity, now constitutes the interpretive framework within which all data of historical geology are supposed to be explained. Furthermore, this philosophy of evolutionary uniformitarianism now serves also as the interpretive framework in the social sciences and economics, and even in the study of religion itself. Thus a superstructure of gigantic size has been erected on the Lyellian-Darwinian foundation.

However, catastrophism is not dead. The inadequacies of a thorough-going uniformitarianism have become increasingly obvious in recent years, and such quasi-catastrophist concepts as wandering continents, shifting poles, slipping crusts, meteoritic and cometary collisions, etc., are appearing more and more frequently in geological literature. It is, in fact, generally recognized that even the ordinary fossiliferous deposits of the sedimentary rocks must often have at least a semi-catastrophist basis, since the process of fossilization usually requires rather rapid burial, under conditions seldom encountered in the modern world. Most geological processes of the present seem to be non-catastrophic in nature, but catastrophes of some sort seem necessary to explain many of the earth's geological formations. Application of Occam's Razor (the principle that the minimum number of hypotheses for possible explanation of phenomena should be employed) suggests that just one or a few great catastrophes would be more reasonable as an explanation than would be a great number of such events.

Biblical Catastrophism

The above considerations lead to the suggestion that a return to Biblical Catastrophism as the interpretive framework for historical geology is well worth considering at this time. Modern

This paper was presented at the monthly meeting of the Houston Geological Society, Houston, Texas, on September 10, 1962.

studies in Biblical archaeology have demonstrated that the Bible is amazingly reliable in its historical sections, despite over a hundred years of propaganda to the contrary. Pious veneration of the Bible for its "spiritual values" is hardly consistent with a rejection of its scientific and historical teachings, for if the latter cannot be trusted--that is, statements which are susceptible to actual human investigation and proof--then how can its "spiritual" teachings, which are not susceptible of proof, be trusted?

And the Bible does have a great deal to say about the early history of the earth and the universe, not only in the book of Genesis, but throughout both Old and New Testaments. If the Bible is actually what its writers univocally claim it to be--and what Jesus Christ and His apostles accepted and taught it to be--then it is really and truly the inspired Word of God, and its teachings concerning Creation and other events of early history are not legends but actual facts of history. If one simply assumes this as an act of faith, and makes his deductions on that basis, he soon finds that the Bible presents a perfectly consistent and harmonious account of earth history, with which it is possible to harmonize all the data of historical geology, as well as pertinent data in other fields.

The objection that such a presupposition will necessarily color the conclusions derived from it is, of course, valid. On the other hand, it should be recognized that evolutionary interpretations also are derived from definite presuppositions. It is nothing but pure assumption that makes a man suppose he must interpret all data within a naturalistic, uniformitarian mold. Therefore, it is not only legitimate but also highly important that the inferences based on the Biblical presuppositions also be seriously considered and evaluated.

The Biblical Framework

The major elements of the Biblical framework, within which all data should be organized, are three great recorded facts of history. These events are: (1) the Creation; (2) the Fall; and (3) the Flood.

The fact of real Creation, out of nothing, is fundamental to any form of theism and especially to Christian theism. For if anything at all has really been "created," that substance must have been created with an "appearance of age." On the assumption of uniformity, on the other hand, it would always be possible to imagine some sort of evolutionary history for even the simplest created substance. Denial of the possibility of the creation of "apparent age" amounts to denial of the possibility of any genuine creation and thus is essentially atheism.

Another intensely significant fact concerning Creation is that it was accomplished by processes no longer in operation. According to the Bible, all things were created in six days, following which "God ended his work which he had made" (Gen. 2:2). The Sabbath was then instituted in commemoration of God's completed work of Creation. Therefore the physical processes which we can now study belong to an entirely different order of things and can give us no clue whatever to the history of the Creation period; this latter history can only be known through divine revelation.

This conclusion is strongly confirmed scientifically by the law of energy conservation, the first law of thermodynamics. This is the most firmly established of all scientific laws and is really

the basic principle upon which all modern science is really grounded. Energy, in the fullest sense, includes everything in the physical and biological universe, and this law essentially affirms that no creation of energy is now taking place. Such creation must therefore have been an event of the past, and this is exactly what Scripture teaches.

To some extent, therefore, the whole world was created at some time in the past, by processes unknown to us, with an "appearance of age." This fact must be given full consideration in the construction of a geological history or the use of a geological chronometer. For instance, the primeval ocean may already have been saline, radioactive minerals may already have contained daughter elements, light from distant stars may have been visible on the earth at the instant of their creation, and so on, even as Adam was created as a full-grown man.

The second basic fact around which historical data must be organized is that of the Curse. According to the revelation given by God, the original Creation was, in every respect, "very good" (Gen. 1:31). There was nothing out of balance, no disharmony, no suffering, no struggle and, above all, no death in the world. According to the Apostle Paul, "by man came death" (I Cor. 15:21). When man sinned, God pronounced a Curse, not only on man but also on his whole dominion, the earth and everything in it. This Curse primarily involves the principle of decay and death. The "whole creation" is now in the "bondage of corruption" (that is, "decay"), according to Romans 8:21-22. There is, everywhere, a natural tendency toward disintegration and ultimate death.

This Biblical doctrine is, of course, firmly supported by the second law of thermodynamics. This law which, like the first law, is as strongly proved as any fact of science, states that, in any closed system, there is a natural increase of disorder and disorganization. The energy (or information, or order) of the system tends to become less available or useful or organized. Everything tends to wear out, to grow old, to run down, and finally to approach a state of death. Obviously this law flatly contradicts the notion of evolution, which assumes that everything naturally tends to become more orderly and highly organized.

But the most significant of these facts, from the standpoint of historical geology, is that there could have been no suffering or struggle or death in the world until after man had sinned. Consequently, the fossils of all formerly living animals now found in the earth's sedimentary rocks must be dated subsequently to this event, the Fall of Man.

This leads to the third basic fact in the Biblical framework. If the great thickness of fossil-bearing strata have been deposited only after man's fall, then nothing less than catastrophic deposition can possibly account for most of them. The Bible clearly describes this Catastrophe, and we now know it as the Genesis Flood or as the Great Deluge in the days of Noah.

According to the record, it was because of the utterly and hopelessly wicked condition into which the earth's original peoples had degenerated that God sent a cataclysmic Deluge to "destroy man with the earth" (Gen. 6:13). This event is described in detail in Genesis 6 through 9 and is referred to many times in other parts of the Bible and by Jesus Christ Himself. It is also recorded, in more or less incomplete and distorted fashion, in the legends of hundreds of peoples all over the world.

According to the Apostle Peter, "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished" (II Peter 3:6). As described in the Bible, the flood-water covered the entire globe for a year and was immensely destructive in effect. All of the processes of sedimentation, volcanism, tectonism, fossilization, etc., were extremely active during this period. No true scheme of historical geology could possibly be erected without full consideration of the tremendous geologic records that must necessarily have been inscribed in the earth's crust by this event.

Geologic Implications

Acceptance of this Biblical framework of interpretation would have very little effect on the organization and use of the vast bulk of accumulated geologic data and methodology. The disciplines of mineralogy, petrology, hydrology, structural geology, petroleum geology, economic geology, etc., would be very little affected, in any practical way, by the problem of whether the data of historical geology should be organized in terms of evolutionary uniformitarianism or in terms of Biblical Creationism and Catastrophism.

There are essentially only two significant points where changes in interpretation would be necessitated, but these are quite important. In the first place, the principle of uniformity must be modified sufficiently to accommodate the three great discontinuities of Creation, the Fall, and the Flood. In the second place, the theory of evolution must be abandoned. Although these two concepts are pure hypotheses, which have never been verified, they of course have the status of Sacred Cows, and one can question their universal validity only at the risk of being charged with medieval ignorance and prejudice. Nevertheless, their validity has never been demonstrated and they are simply accepted as Articles of Faith. In fact, there is an abundance of scientific evidence that they are not valid. Rather than being hindered by their rejection, it is very likely that historical geology would be greatly benefited by release from their shackles.

With reference to uniformity, it has already been noted that this principle has proved inadequate in numerous areas, so that a quasi-catastrophism is already quite prominent in geologic interpretation. There are many very important unsolved problems in geology and it is likely that their solution has been delayed by an implicit reliance on uniformity. Typical of these important unsolved problems are: (1) the cause of mountain-building; (2) the origin of geosynclines; (3) the origin of petroleum; (4) the cause of continental glaciation; (5) the mechanics of overthrusting; (6) the cause of peneplains; (7) the cause of world-wide warm climates; (8) the nature of volcanism productive of vast volcanic terrains; (9) the nature of continental uplift processes; (10) the origin of mineral deposits; (11) the nature of metamorphism; (12) the origin of saline deposits; (13) the nature of granitization; (14) the origin of coal measures; and so on and on. Not one of the above phenomena has yet been adequately explained in terms of present processes, and this is true of an innumerable variety of other important geological phenomena as well. Uniformity is therefore entirely undeserving of its sacrosanct position in geological interpretation. On the other hand, all of the above phenomena lend themselves quite readily to interpretation in terms of the Creation-Catastrophe framework.

The concept of evolution is even more vulnerable than that of uniformity. As already seen, it is squarely contradicted by the second law of thermodynamics. In fact, most of the evidences commonly cited for evolution are in reality evidences of deterioration! For example, the very mechanism believed to cause evolution, that of genetic mutation, is actually a mechanism of disorganization. A mutation results when something causes a sudden and random change in the genetic structure of the germ cell. Such changes, except possibly in such rare accidental circum-

stances as to be negligible, result in a decrease of order in the germ cell and therefore in some definite harm to the creature experiencing it. Natural selection then acts to weed out those creatures experiencing mutations, and thus to preserve the previous form of the species. If any permanent change occurs in the natural state, it almost certainly must be a deterioration of the species (witness the evidence of vestigial organs, and the evidence that most modern animals are represented in the fossil record by larger and stronger forms than are now living).

The only evidence for evolution carrying any real weight is that afforded by the fossil record itself, which presumably shows a gradual increase of variety and complexity of organisms with the advance of geologic time. Thus the data of historical geology, especially that of paleontology, is the only real evidence for evolution, and this is why the study of historical geology has assumed such great importance. But in view of the fact that all true scientific law, as well as the testimony of Scripture, negates the very possibility of true evolution, it is evident that this evidence from paleontology has somehow been misunderstood.

In fact, a very serious case of circular reasoning seems to be present here. The Geologic Column has essentially been built up on the basis of the fossil data, interpreted on the assumption of evolution. Rocks containing simple fossils are called old and those with complex fossils are called young. The idealized, 100-mile thick, geologic column does not actually exist anywhere in the world, but has been constructed by superposition of formations from many areas, and the principle used in its erection has been that of evolution. Consequently, the one real proof of evolution has been developed on the basis of the assumption of evolution! This is admittedly an oversimplification of the case, but it is nevertheless fundamentally the correct situation.

In any locality, it is true that there usually seems to be an increase in complexity of the contained fossils with increasing elevation, and also that the fossil assemblages tend to occur in more or less distinct zones. The accepted system of subdivision of the geologic column is quite useful as a taxonomic device, whether or not it has any real meaning as an evolutionary series. Even at best, however, there are many omissions and inversions found at specific localities, and these have to be explained away by such extreme devices as epochs of erosion, overthrusts, etc.

It is quite possible, on the other hand, to explain these same data equally well or better in terms of the Deluge. The Biblical descriptions of the Flood indicate a tremendous complex of events occurring during the Flood year--worldwide torrential rains, tremendous erosion, worldwide tectonic and volcanic upheavals, violent windstorms, gigantic waves and tsunamis, etc., as well as great destruction of all forms of life, followed necessarily by extensive burials in great "graveyards" of future fossil deposits. An infinite variety of depositional characteristics could be postulated at various times and places during the Deluge, often violent but also often relatively quiescent.

In general, however, the depositional sequences of fossils, in any one vertical column, would tend to be from simple to complex, with increase in elevation. This order is that of: (1) increasing elevation of habitat--an ecological zonation; (2) increasing resistance to settling, because of more complex boundary geometry and lesser specific gravity; and (3) increasing size and mobility, with consequent increasing ability to postpone inundation and burial by the rising Flood waters. These sequences would of course be statistical, rather than absolute, and would be subject to many exceptions, but they would certainly represent the dominant trends. And all of this is exactly what is found in the strata, even though it has been misinterpreted to teach evolution!

Thus, the rejection of evolution and of absolute uniformity would not only be quite possible but would probably also be potentially of great value in further geologic research. As one example of how the Biblical framework could solve a perplexing geologic problem, consider the question of worldwide climatic change. The Bible indicates that there existed before the Flood a vast blanket of water vapor around the earth. Among other things, this thermal canopy would have produced just such a universal warm, pleasant climate as is indicated for most of the systems of the geologic column. Its precipitation not only was one of the two main causes of the Flood (the other was the worldwide break-up of the "fountains of the great deep," which were probably vast subterranean waters and magmas previously restrained under great pressure below the crust), but also would have led to a sudden chilling of the climate and resultant continental glaciation.

Importance of the Question

If all of this were simply a question of geology and its interpretation, there would be little reason for anyone to press for such a radical shift in orientation as here proposed. Even if this were all, however, the possibility of an alternative type of scientific generalization would at least warrant investigation, strictly from the scientific standpoint.

However, there is much more at stake here than simply a matter of geologic interpretation. The philosophy of evolutionary uniformitarianism has penetrated very deeply into nearly every aspect of human life. Evolution has become fundamental in the treatment of psychology, of sociology, political science, economics, philosophy,--even religion. It is the cornerstone of Dewey's educational philosophy. Through Nietzsche's adoption and application of Darwinism, evolution became eventually the quasi-scientific basis of Fascism and Nazism. Even more seriously, Karl Marx adapted and extended the concept of evolution in developing the Communistic system, and modern Communism today is grounded squarely on the theory of evolution. This is true, in fact, for socialism and all its forms, as well as for every other anti-Christian system of the present day.

Jesus said: "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit" (Matthew 7:18). The modern fruit of the evolutionary philosophy--Communism, Nazism, progressive educationism, materialism, existentialism, Freudianism, behaviourism, and the rest--warrants a very serious and critical look at the nature of the tree itself.

Modern geologists can render a uniquely important service to mankind by re-examining, critically, the paleontological foundation on which rests this gigantic structure of evolution and its bitter fruits. A renewed recognition of the reality of Creation and the sovereignty of the Creator, in the history of the earth and in the lives of men, could serve a mighty evangelistic and purifying purpose in the world, in these latter days.

THE LOGOS CONCEPT

A Critical Monograph on John 1:1
Abridged by the Author

EDGAR J. LOVELADY
Winona Lake, Indiana

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

The title Logos was the chief theological term descriptive of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, which was applied in the full-flowered Christology of the ancient church, being in a very distinct sense the basic content and starting-point of the doctrine of Christ. And yet Biblically this title is found only in the Johannine group of New Testament writings; here in John 1:1, in I John 1:1, and in Revelation 19:13. Since John presents Christ as Logos introductory to his Gospel, he reveals that this title is convenient and, more than that, absolutely essential to a proper understanding of the relationship between the pre-existent Son of God and the historically-manifested divine revelation in the human life of Jesus. With stately simplicity John introduces the Lord Jesus Christ out of the eternal ages, representing Him not only as the focal point of history, but also as the expansion of history in relation to creation, preservation, and revelation in the world.

Picture yourself as a Jewish Christian familiar with the Book of Beginnings in the Septuagint version. It begins, en arche, just as in the opening words of John's Gospel. This would suggest John's acquaintance with the Old Testament in Greek, as well as a conscious effort on his part, by inspiration, to take this appropriate and stimulating concept and use it to give a new genesis account, now laid bare in conformity with the One Who manifested revelation in its several forms. This leads us to several very important questions: What did John mean when he applied this title to Christ? (And he clearly did so, as in John 1:14-18.) And since the idea of the Logos was a widespread concept in the ancient world, whence was the origin of this well-known linguistic expression, and what of its function in earlier usage?

Therefore it will be our task to trace the Logos concept in most of its forms in its historical development; then to ascertain the extent and the effects of this concept in its several distinct areas upon John's identification of the Logos; and finally, to seek to arrive at various distinctions and syntheses relative to the problem. Once this has been accomplished, a brief exegesis of the verse itself will be undertaken, on the basis of the familiar structural analysis.

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS OF THE JOHANNINE SOURCE

1. The Philosophical Logos Concept. The Hellenic concept of the Logos was a doctrine of the Logos as the Divine Reason: the Logos was the rational principle or impersonal energy which was responsible for the founding and organization of the world. Thus the Logos was an abstraction, not an hypostasis (a transliteration of the Greek hupostasis, "substance," hereafter denoting a real personal subsistence or person).

2. The Pagan Gnostic Concept. This view, held by Bultmann, is that the Logos was a "mythological intermediary being" between God and man. Here is an approach to the Docetic heresy in that this intermediary being at one time even became man, and saved the world by saving himself.
3. The Hebrew "Word" Source. This is the view that the theological usage of the term Logos is derived directly either from the true Old Testament concept of the dēbhar Jahweh, or the Palestinian Aramaic Memra, in which the outward dynamic expression of the Word was the chief feature. Of course, we must distinguish between inspired and uninspired literature, but in both cases the same descriptive term "Word" was used as active, instrumental, creative, personal, and revelatory in function.
4. The Philonian Source. In short, Philo's system provided that since God was so far above the realm of creation, His contact with the world could only have been through the medium of intermediate powers, which, for Philo, became personalized when he replaced the Platonic term "Ideas" with the Old Testament term "the Word of God," using Logos as the Greek equivalent of that Scriptural form.
5. The "Special Guidance of the Spirit" View. Here is an opinion which holds that it is useless to inquire as to the origin of this idea in the mind of John; we really have little to do with the origin of the term; for if we believe that John was one of those men who had the special guidance of the Spirit, then the term Logos is applied to Christ by God Himself, and it becomes us only to inquire why it is so applied to Him.
6. The Hebrew "Wisdom" Source. J. Rendel Harris takes the prologue of John directly back to the Wisdom references in Old Testament literature. It is asserted that there is a connection between the Logos and the Sophia which makes them practically interchangeable. Proverbs 8:22-23 sets the stage for this linkage, going on to elaborate on the activity of this "Wisdom," which is parallel in several ways to the Old Testament concept of the creative Word, becoming in later Judaism an intermediary personification, a Divine hypostasis.

THE HISTORICO-LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND

Since the idea of the Logos was a concept of widespread usage in oriental-Semitic and Greek literature both before and contemporaneous with Christianity, it is not only profitable, but essential for us to examine some of the actual material which presents the various facets of the Logos concept. Of course, the very archaic forms must be treated as ultimate sources which hark back to revelation at creation, which have become corrupted due to the depravity of human nature, but which also have survived in one form or another, finally arriving at the true, though perhaps incomplete doctrine of the Creative Word in the Old Testament, and at last, the perfect realization of this doctrine in the identification made by John: "In the beginning was the Word."

Some of the earliest historical notices that we have come from Egypt, the "Gift of the Nile," which in turn became one of the two cradles of civilization. In the Egyptian cosmogony the divine

creative activity was predominant in fashioning the gods and the elements of heaven and earth according to divine thought and the sacred oracle. Atum, or Ptaḥ, or Thoth (according to historical period and geographical location) become the "heart and tongue" of the council of the gods, and the utterance of the thought in the form of a divine fiat brought forth the world. From the Memphite theology comes this illustrative text:

Ptaḥ the Great, that is, the heart and tongue of the Ennead; [Ptaḥ] ...who gave birth to gods;...There came into being as the heart and there came into being as the tongue (something) in the form of Atum. The mighty Great One is Ptaḥ, who transmitted [life] to all gods, as well as (to) their ka's through this heart, by which Horus became Ptaḥ, and through this tongue, by which Thoth became Ptoḥ...And so Ptaḥ was satisfied (or, "rested"), after he had made everything, as well as all the divine order.¹

Quite naturally, creation stories such as this one offer divergences due to locality and time-sequence, but the patterns and results are practically the same throughout, although the methodological symbolisms tend to vary.

This concept is more forcefully presented in Sumero-Babylonian thought in the form of poetry which represented the word of the god as a powerful, dynamic figure, the extension of the divine energy in the realm of creation and earthly affairs. All that the creating deity had to do was to lay his plans, utter the word, and pronounce the name.² An Akkadian hymn to the moon-god Sin portrays the dynamistic aspect of this concept in Mesopotamia:

Thou! When thy word is pronounced in heaven the
Igigi prostrate themselves.
Thou! When thy word is pronounced on earth the
Anunnaki kiss the ground.
Thou! When thy word drifts along in heaven like
the wind it makes rich the feeding and
drinking of the land.
Thou! When thy word settles down on the earth
green vegetation is produced.
Thou! Thy word makes fat the sheepfold and stall;
it makes living creatures widespread.
Thou! Thy word causes truth and justice to be,
so that the people speak the truth.
Thou! Thy word which is far away in heaven, which
is hidden in the earth is something no one sees.
Thou! Who can comprehend thy word, who can equal it?³

Even apart from such poetic representations, the Sumerian and Akkadian terms enem and awātu give linguistic evidence of the dynamistic association of the "word."⁴ The foregoing factors support our thesis that these ancient peoples conceived of the divine word under the image of physical-cosmic power, in which the voice of the god acts separately and distinctly as an entity possessing power. We take this as a strong indication that the "word" concept is basically of Near Eastern origin, an oriental development long before the Greeks launched into their more lauded speculations. Quite naturally, these pagan references indicate their own degeneration, since they

exhibit a vast difference from the Biblical usage, as will be shown presently. Our position on matters of common expression in the ancient Near East is that in the Biblical account the concept is preserved from error, a factor which does not militate against the statements of truth found in profane sources, but which does account for the differences.

In the Canaanite literature discovered at the ancient site of Ugarit the expressions are largely parallel to those of Mesopotamia. Baal, the storm-god, creates a thunderbolt to demonstrate his command to men when he re-institutes prosperity on the earth. He also reveals his word in the phenomena of nature--whisper of stones, rustling of trees, roar of the deep, and celestial music.⁵ Baal gives forth his voice from the clouds when he furnishes rain in the form of a thunderstorm:

When Baal gives forth his holy voice,
When Baal keeps discharging the utterance of his lips,
his holy voice shakes the earth,
...the mountains quake,
a-quiver are...east and west,
the high places of the earth rock.⁶

The significance of this usage is the poetic representation given to the voice and speech of Baal in the active fury of the re-instituted thunderstorm, showing the conceptual relationship, mythologically interpreted, between the emanation of Baal's voice and the active forces in nature. The word of Baal is not clearly hypostatized as a distinct conceptual being having personal existence, but this usage does show the concept of the divine word as more than mere conversation; it indicates a tendency of the Oriental mind to conceive of God's relation to the forces and personages of this world as being mediated through the almighty word of his voice.

The Hellenic doctrine of the Logos has been influential in both philosophical and Christian thought, for it deals with an attempt to explain and comprehend God's relation to the world, actually the basis of all religio-philosophical speculation. And speculation it was, for the Hellenic impartiality in combining a strong sense of reality with an equally strong power of abstraction enabled these Greeks at an early date to recognize their religious ideas for what they actually were: creations of artistic imagination. Thereby they set a world of ideas in place of a mythological world, a world built up by the strength of independent human thought, the Logos, which could claim to explain reality in a natural way. For Heraclitus, Logos meant a law, an impersonal law of change.⁷ To Anaxagoras Logos was Mind, an impersonal moving principle.⁸ Plato conceived the Logos as the intermediate Demiurge which God had to form matter from perfect Ideas.⁹ For the Stoics, the intelligible structure of the universe was the Logos: active, creative world-reason, unfolding the divine plan in world processes by myriad forms and laws which give individual divine manifestation to individual objects and their activities. This pantheistic concept can be eminently seen in Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus:

For that we are Thine offspring; nay, all that in
myriad motion
Lives for its day on the earth bears one impress--
thy likeness--upon it...
Aye, for thy conquering hands have a servant of
living fire--

Sharp is the bolt!--where it falls, Nature shrinks
 at the shock and doth shudder.
 Thus thou directest the Word universal that pulses
 through all things...¹⁰

Thus in Greek thought there was no personal transcendent God like the God of the Old Testament, much less that of the personalized Logos of the Gospel of John. And the volatile usage of the word logos by the Hellenes does not significantly indicate a dynamistic conception so characteristic of Semitic literature.

The Old Testament is an ancient book of Near Eastern geographical origin, and in this sense contains various common conceptions found generally in "the Fertile Crescent." But the Hebrews made use of Near Eastern representations not just to represent their own views, but as a vehicle to convey truth by way of illustration, or for the purposes of aesthetic appreciation. One of these conceptions which the Old Testament has utilized for these purposes is the idea surrounding the powerful aspect of divine word. But there is an important distinction between the two groups, and this is one of form: in the Old Testament the word of Yahweh is never a mere force of nature as was the case in surrounding cultures, for the extra-Biblical gods were personified forces of nature, while Yahweh was personal, transcendent, and moral from the very beginning of Hebrew history; hence the dēbhar Yahweh is the function of a conscious, moral personality. In profane Semitic literature the "word" of the god was a material, physical principle, while in the Old Testament the Word exists in the actuating expression of the transcendent God. This can be seen in at least four aspects in the Old Testament: (1) the Creative (Psa. 33:6; 104:7; 148:1-5); (2) the Mediatorial-Preservative (Psa. 107:20; 147:15-18; 148:6,8); (3) the Judicial (Hos. 6:5; Isa. 11:4); and, (4) the Prophetic (Isa. 9:8; Jer. 33:14). The two strongest passages which support an independent personification of the Word as divine creative activity are Psalm 33:6; "By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth" (A.S.V.), and Isaiah 55:10, 11: "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." (A.S.V.)

From the uninspired literature largely dating from the Inter-Testamental period we are able to discern a departure from the Old Testament terminology surrounding the Word. In the canonical writings it was "the Word of God," while in these it is simply "the Word," perhaps the result of yielding to extra-Jewish pressures in a world that was rapidly becoming cosmopolitanized. The "Word" is remarkably hypostatized in the Wisdom of Solomon 18:15, 16:

Thine all-powerful word leaped from heaven out of
 the royal throne,
 A stern warrior, into the midst of the doomed land,
 Bearing as a sharp sword thine unfeigned commandment;
 And standing it filled all things with death;
 And while it touched heaven it trode upon the earth.

This usage is rather in line with the Aramaic Targumim, which represented the acts of God by the personification of His attributes. The reason for this substitution in the Targumim was the matter of avoiding the offense of anthropomorphisms, the possible misinterpretation of the text, and the desire of some overly-zealous Jews to protect the holiness of God by using terms which designated certain attributes or aspects of His personality. To quote Albright, "In Deut. 4:24 it is not God Himself, but His Mêmra which is a consuming fire."¹¹ The Mêmra (word) was objectivized as activities in the terms of a mediator, but at the same time failing to identify the mediator with the Messiah.

There are two passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls that are claimed by some to have a bearing on the doctrine of creation as found in the Johannine Prologue.¹² In spite of the superficial similarity to the Johannine passage, the Qumran references are not identical at all because of one major difference: the Dead Sea Scriptures attribute creation to God, while John ascribes it to "the Word," Who, in New Testament theology is the Son of God, Jesus Christ, distinct from God the Father in personality, though not in essence. However, several Qumran passages are in line with the characteristic Semitic conception of the dynamic word, at times approaching the Old Testament form.

The Logos-doctrine was the bedrock of Philo's system, the focal-point of all his views. He took Hellenic concepts and attempted to synthesize them with the Word of the transcendent God found in the Old Testament. The result was the Logos as an intermediary being between God and the created world. His notable weakness is in oscillating between a personal and impersonal being; that is, it is inconsistent to represent, as he does, the Logos as a person distinct from God and at the same time as only a property of God actively operating in the world. Without further elaboration we can state confidently that in Philo the Logos differed from the Logos in John with respect to person, deity, existence, activity, historical manifestation, and terminology, discrepancies which militate against the possibility that John directly borrowed the concept from Philo.

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO THE ORIGIN OF THE JOHANNINE CONCEPT

We can properly approach the problem of the Johannine usage on the basis of its alignment with the Semitic, and, more narrowly and directly, Hebrew expressions. This is not to minimize the extent to which John introduced new elements and fresh interpretation to the Logos concept by means of the revelation of inspiration and the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. But in view of the extensive quotation of Old Testament Scripture by the Christian authors stimulated by the guidance of the Holy Spirit along with their strongly-imbedded personal familiarity with the Jewish Scriptures, it is most natural to look to such a source for the key to John's employment of the term "Word." And Christ Himself revealed such a foundation when He said to the Jews, "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me" (John 5:39, 40 A.S.V.).

From the Old Testament come four lines of teaching which have a bearing on John's doctrine, and with which the Johannine concept marvellously agrees. These are: (1) the Word of the personal God as causative divine formative energy, responsible for the present arrangement of the cosmos (Gen. 1); (2) the appearance of the mal'ach Yahweh, the "Angel of the Lord," God's

messenger of revelation to the patriarchs and prophets; (3) the activity of the d^ebhar Yahweh, "the Word of Jehovah," primarily in the Psalms and Prophets; and (4) the prominent Wisdom passages of Proverbs 8 and Job 28.

This Christological concept is unintelligible and inexplicable as a Christian doctrine outside its rich heritage in God's most ancient inspired revelation: John interpreted what he knew of the Word personally in unequivocal conformity with the Old Testament. And this thought is suggestive of our whole approach to the issue: that the supreme influence in John's mind was the Person of Christ Himself and the realization that in this pure and holy life of Christ on earth all of God's purposes in revelation were accomplished. This is the conclusion we reach after a study of John's Gospel and his other writings: he was simply overwhelmed by the truth of Christ's message, and this was explainable on no other grounds than that He in Himself was the true message He proclaimed, the very revelation of God, indeed, The Word. John's conviction on this matter was further heightened by an acute sensitivity to the Old Testament teaching that the Word was mediator of creation and revelation, a consideration further supported by other New Testament writers' use of the Old Testament as the only authoritative pre-Christian source of doctrine. This assertion is further borne out by the impact of Christ Himself on other authors of the New Testament, along with their comparable teaching of the eternal pre-existence of Christ and His ministry in creation and redemption, which at last becomes the content of the Christian message: the word of reconciliation.

We would stress, then, that the Biblical and Personal elements were the foremost and immediate elements in the development of Johannine Christology, making the employment of logos emphatically and distinctively a Christian concept, and more than that, a revelation by the Spirit of God. And what of these extra-Biblical instances of hypostatical speculation? It need not be absolutely denied that John was acquainted with them, and did, indeed, enjoy in their presentation a preparation for the final, divinely-inspired view of the Logos, a preparation both in the partial truths these speculations contained, and by way of antithesis to their erroneous conceptions. But these were only secondary and subordinate to the Biblical and Personal aspects, which charged John's message with that vital, life-giving energy drawn from the Word Himself, the "power of God unto salvation," "even to them that believe on His name."

A BRIEF EXEGESIS OF THE VERSE

The Apostle John forcefully introduces his theological life of Christ by the first attribute predicated of the Logos, His Pre-existence, His Eternity: "In the beginning was the Word." The similarity of en archē to b^erēšît in Genesis 1:1 is prominent, the Genesis account marking the temporal initiation of creation. By this identification the writer is saying, "When the act of creation took place the Word was." The exact source of regarding the Word's Eternity of Person is found in the imperfect ēn, "was." This construction features the durative aspect of the imperfect tense, for "the augment throws linear action into the past."¹³ This construction thus affirms that the Logos already was existing prior to the punctiliar act of creation, throwing back the concept of the Word's Being from the impact of creation into timeless eternity. From a philosophical standpoint John's construction may be inadequate, for to use ēn in order to express duration and continuance in an area where there is no possibility for such a designation (in eternity) would be a categorical contradiction. But the existential verb eimi, which designates a thing as existing as

distinguished from non-existent, coupled with the durative imperfect, comes as close to representing pure, eternal Being as it is possible for the tongue of man to come in such a succinct statement.

The second attribute of the Word, that of Equality with God, is distinguished by the Personality of the Logos as identified by the preposition pros: "and the Word was with God." It was no accident that this preposition was used, for the preposition pros is distinctive above all others in the aspect of close proximity, "denoting direction towards a thing or position and state looking towards the object. One might correctly say that this preposition gives the distinct impression of a tendency toward, a movement in the direction of, God. It has even been translated as "face to face with God."¹⁵ This would require conceiving of a relationship between two persons, the one an absolute being, completely independent, sufficient within Himself, towards which the other continually tends (en). This fact-to-face relationship is sustained by two other passages, Mark 14:49, and II Cor. 5:8. In accord with these usages John specifies the fellowship, and hence the equality, that exists between the Logos and God as between persons, and does not consider them as abstract, metaphysical concepts. At first glance there might be interpreted a duality of Deity from this phrase, or a subordination or creation-emanation from God, superficially regarded. John leaves it to the next phrase to reconcile this problem, and the answer given there shows decisively that it is only the Personality of the Word that is being considered in this second proposition.

John 1:1 has long been a battle-ground between orthodox Christians, who would uphold the doctrine of the Trinity, and the non-trinitarians, who by their interpretations exhibit tendencies toward polytheism, Unitarianism, or Arianism. The focal point of this controversy is the third proposition dealing with the Deity, or Essence of the Word stated by John in this verse: "And the Word was God." Defective views such as those of Arianism were long ago rejected by the common action of Christians who held to the orthodox position of the Christian faith. But in spite of this well-known fact a form of the Arian heresy persists to this day. The most active exponents of this teaching are the "International Bible Students," more popularly known as "Jehovah's Witnesses." Their view of the Person of Christ is represented in this quotation from their most recent literature:

He (the Logos) is the "only begotten Son" because he is the only one whom God himself created directly without the agency or co-operation of any creature (John 3:16 A.V.; A.S.; Dy). If the Word or Logos was not the first living creature whom God created, who, then, is God's first created Son, and how has this first creation been honored, and used as the first-made one of the family of God's sons? We know of no one but the Word or Logos.¹⁶

The absence of the article ho with theos in the predicate nominative construction of this verse is claimed to support the foregoing interpretation; that the Logos was like God as a god, possessing some of the qualities of God, but not God Himself or a part of God.¹⁷ To this we would apply the following refutation:

1. If John had wished to convey this impression he could have used theios--"divine, deity, like God"--already used in II Pet. 1:3 and Acts 17:29.
2. To posit such an intermediary being would be to contradict the strict monotheism of Scripture.

3. A study of predicate nouns with and without the article occurring both before and after the verb (by E.C. Colwell of the University of Chicago) shows that out of 112 definite predicates before the verb, only 15 are used with the article (13%), while 97 are used without the article (87%). From this and other discussion he concludes that word-order and not definiteness is the variable quantum in passages of this nature. The exceptions to the general rule that definite predicate nouns regularly take the article are: (1) definite predicate nouns which follow the verb usually take the article; (2) definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article; (3) proper names regularly lack the article in the predicate.

4. The principles here outlined are at once destructive of the arguments advanced by those who would regard the construction as indefinite. The study by Colwell shows that a predicate nominative preceding the verb cannot be translated as indefinite solely because of the absence of the article, if the context suggests that the predicate is definite, clearly the case here.

5. The statement "and the Word was God" is not strange in the prologue of the Gospel that is climaxed by Thomas' confession, "My Lord and my God."

The proposition as we have interpreted it recognized the Logos as God in the fullest sense of all that man can conceive of God to be. It resolves the seeming duality suggested by the second proposition in affirming that the Word simply is God. This leaves us with a paradox which is irreconcilable by human logic and which stands logically unresolved in the New Testament. The Logos is God, and yet He is with God. That is to say that God and the Logos are not two beings, and yet they are also not identical. The obvious conclusion is that the Logos is God with respect to essence, while He is distinct with reference to personality, harmonizing with the testimony of other Scripture on the distinctions and unifying factors within the Trinity. We must take these Biblical statements as they stand, realizing that on the one hand the Persons of the Godhead are equal in being, power, and glory (Matt. 28:19, II Cor. 13:14), while on the other, there exist certain distinctions of activity and voluntary subordination between them, but these concern their respective functions. The primary function of the Logos, as we have seen, was to reveal the action of God in this earthly framework by the processes of creation, preservation, and revelation, and redemption. And He did all this because of Who He Was!

PARAPHRASE

"At the initiation of time when the creation of the world took place, the Logos--(the pre-existent, pre-incarnate Son of God, Who personally intervened in the cosmos for the purposes of creation, preservation, and revelation)--this Logos was already with God the Father, and this same Word was the essence of God in the most absolute sense."

DOCUMENTATION

1. John A. Wilson, "The theology of Memphis," Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton Univ. Press), p. 5.
2. S. N. Kramer, "Sumerian Theology and Ethics," The Harvard Theological Review, XLIX (January 1954), pp. 53, 54.
3. Ibid., p. 50.
4. W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Doubleday), p. 195.

5. H.L. Ginsberg, "Poems about Baal and Anath," Religions of the Ancient Near East, ed. Isaac Mendelsohn (Liberal Arts Press), p. 245.
6. Theodor H. Gaster, Thespis (Doubleday), p. 197.
7. Gordon H. Clark, Thales to Dewey (Houghton Mifflin), p. 19.
8. Ibid., p. 34.
9. Ibid., p. 94.
10. Frederick Mayer, A History of Ancient & Medieval Philosophy (American Book Co.), pp. 228, 229.
11. Albright, op. cit., p. 372.
12. Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (Doubleday), pp. 43, 82.
13. James H. Moulton, A Grammar of N.T. Greek (Clark), Vol. I, p. 128.
14. Joseph H. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon (Clark), p. 541.
15. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek N.T. (Broadman), p. 623.
16. "The Word"--Who is He? According to John (Watch Tower), p. 59.
17. Ibid., pp. 56, 58.
18. E.C. Colwell, "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek N.T.," Reprint from Journal of Biblical Literature, LII (1933), p. 9.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE ANTICHRIST

HERMAN A. HOYT
President, Grace Theological Seminary

INTRODUCTION

Just as the seed of the woman culminated in the great masterpiece of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, so also the seed of the serpent will ultimately culminate in the great masterpiece of Satan, the great Antichrist of the endtime. This person will surpass all his forebears in power, prominence, pride, blasphemy, ruthlessness and lawlessness. This adversary of God, Christ, the saints, and even humanity itself will sound the death knell of civilization. At last his destruction will mark the close of this present evil age.

Two extreme attitudes have been expressed toward the doctrine of this person set forth in the Scriptures. There are some who do not care for any discussion of this evil genius. This is tragic, for the Bible not only gives an amazing amount of information, but Christian people, and others as well, are hungry for that information. Failure to provide information from the proper source exposes people to information from the wrong source. There are others who want to major on this area of prophetic truth to the exclusion of other precious truth, and thus become lopsided. The proper attitude is to give this doctrine the same measure and place in teaching as do the Scriptures. It will thus take on proper perspective in the thinking of God's people.

For two very good reasons, there ought to be an adequate discussion on this subject. On the one hand, the Scriptures have a great deal to say on this doctrine for the protection and edification of believers. On the other hand there are certain tendencies in operation in the world today that make it clear that such a person will appear on the scene. Believers should be informed so that they will be enabled to discern the signs of the times.

There is a wealth of material in the Old Testament on this subject, but the vast amount of information is to be found in the New Testament. While the picture will not be entirely complete to confine the investigation solely to the New Testament, it is amazing how nearly complete it is. Though isolated details can be found in many books of the New Testament, for the most part the doctrine is confined to Matthew, John, II Thess., I John, II John, and Revelation.

I. THE GREEK TERM "ANTICHRIST" USED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. The meaning of this compound Greek word is threefold in its significance. The preposition anti means to stand over against and thus in opposition to. So that in combination with Christos the ultimate sense is that this one is opposed to Christ.¹ This is not difficult to believe inasmuch as the Scriptures clearly declare that this evil genius shall "make war against him that sat on the white horse" (Rev. 17:14; 19:19), and "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God" (2 Thess. 2:4).

The method of accomplishing this end is suggested by another meaning of the preposition, namely, that it means "in the stead of," hence usurpation or substitution. If the compound word will not bear this meaning, the idea does appear in the Scriptures. Of the Antichrist it is declared that "he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2:4). In this sense he is "a pseudo-Christ who will present himself to humanity as 'the man of the hour'"² (Matt. 24:5,24). The manifestation of this great adversary of Christ, at least at the outset, is that of a counterpart of an imitation of Christ. This is Satan's method. "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:13-15). When this one appears on the scene his "coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness...and...strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. 2:9-11). Thus he comes on "a white horse" (Rev. 6:2).

2. The usage of the term "Antichrist" is confined to the New Testament, though the idea certainly appears in the Old Testament. The apostle John employs the expression five times in his epistles. The first use of the term is to designate this eschatological personage in his qualities as an opposer of Christ. Therefore the definite article is not used: "little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come" (I John 2:18). The second usage points to the "many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time" (I John 2:18). The third use points out one of the essential qualities of this adversary, namely, that he is a liar, for he denies that Jesus is the Christ, and thus denies the Father and the Son (I John 2:22). The fourth use has to do with the message in relation to the first coming of Christ. The spirit of antichrist will not confess "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (I John 1:3). And most amazingly, the fifth appearance of the word is in relation to the second coming of Christ. His spirit will not confess that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (II John 7). "Is come" in I John 4:2 is a perfect tense and is rendered more accurately into English by the expression "has come," whereas the verb in II John 7 is present tense and is best translated into English by the expression, "is coming."

3. The confirmation of the meaning and usage of this term comes in the larger content of teaching in the New Testament bearing on this person. The warnings of Christ cannot be set aside. "For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many" (Matt. 24:5). "For there shall arise false Christs...and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect" (Matt. 24:24). The apostle Paul enlarges on the various details that will characterize the appearance of the Antichrist, such as lawlessness, the working of Satan, and strong delusion (2 Thess. 2:3-12). The apostle John emphasizes the inner meaning or quality of this man in his epistles (I John; II John), leaving the particular identity of this one for rather full presentation in the Book of the Revelation (Rev. 6, 11, 13, 17, 19).

II. THE NAMES OF ANTICHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

As far as it is possible to determine, eight designations are given to this adversary of the end time. In Matthew he is referred to as "the abomination of desolation" (24:15), though more specifically this probably denotes his image, and as a "false Christ" (24:24). In John's gospel he is probably referred to as "the one coming in his own name" (John 5:43). Paul refers to him as "that man of sin," or perhaps better as "the lawless one" (2 Thess. 2:3), and as "the son of perdition"

(2 Thess. 2:3). The name "Antichrist" appears in the epistles of John (I John 2:18; II John 7), and the name "beast" in the Revelation (11:7; 13:2). According to Pink at least 22 names appear in the Old Testament.³ Others still supply additional names from the Scripture.⁴

III. THE PERSONALITY AND GENIUS OF THIS MAN

The greatest person ever to appear in the earth, save one, the Lord Jesus Christ, is yet to come. The great saints of the world such as Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Elijah, Daniel, and Paul fall in the class of holy men, and their greatness belongs to an entirely different sphere. This man will rise head and shoulders above men in general, calculated to earn him the designation of super-man, in fact the worship that belongs to deity. His appearance on the scene, his rise to power, his genius as a military leader, and his exploits will be nothing short of spectacular, colossal, supernatural.

1. He will be different from all other men, so different that the peoples will be saying, "Who is like unto the beast" (Rev. 13:4). In his qualities for kingship he exhibits ability to suffer a death stroke and experience some sort of miraculous healing, producing wonder in the multitudes of earth and eliciting their worship (Rev. 13:3-4). With this sort of leader at the head, his kingdom differs from all other kingdoms.

2. This man will possess an amazingly high degree of intelligence. His number is the nearest approach to perfection that man can reach, which is 666 (Rev. 13:18). For the trinity of holiness the number is 777. For the trinity of evil it is 666. He rises up out of the sea of nations (Rev. 13:1). He demonstrates his ability among ten kings, so that they decide to give their power into his hands (Rev. 17:13). Satan recognizes his qualifications for leadership and gives to him "his power and his seat, and his authority" (Rev. 13:2). He is able to attract the services of an able man to serve as his premier and publicity agent, the false prophet (Rev. 13:11-17).

3. Antichrist turns out to be a great orator and demagogue. He is described as having a "mouth as the mouth of a lion" (Rev. 13:2), suggesting the regal authority with which he speaks. The content of his speaking is "great things" (Rev. 13:5), which may describe the amazing ability he has to handle a wide range of subjects with facility. It seems evident that blasphemy against God, Christ, the saints, and the church will characterize most of his speech. "Upon his heads the name of blasphemy" appear (Rev. 13:1). "There was given unto him a mouth speaking...blasphemies" (Rev. 13:5). "And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven" (Rev. 13:6). Inasmuch as he comes in his own name (John 5:43), the claims for himself will constitute a large part of his public utterance.

4. It seems to be a valid conclusion that this man is a philosopher of some distinction. The "great things" uttered by his mouth surely point in this direction (Rev. 13:5). He appears on the scene in the wake of a great religious rebellion (2 Thess. 2:3). The motivating force of this rebellion is the philosophy of pantheism which prepares the way for the rejection of all thought of the supernatural as in any way transcendent to this world and inculcates the doctrine of the unity of human and divine.⁵ Upon this background he is able to promote his own prominence and make his claims to being divine (2 Thess. 2:4). He traffics with the demonic world (Rev. 16:12), who promulgate doctrines contrary to the sound and wholesome words of Scripture (I Tim. 4:1). Vast throngs of humanity are thus led astray with his clever rationalizing away of the truth (I John 4:1-6).

5. This man is also a clever and persistent politician. He recognizes the value and force of religion. So he does not hesitate to submit outwardly to the domination of the false religious system of the endtime (Rev. 17:3,7). Once he has gained his end, he will turn and destroy the whore who is sitting upon him (Rev. 17:16-17). With craftiness, he gradually rises to power among the ten kings in whose midst he first appears. At last he convinces them that they should form a confederation of which he becomes the head (Rev. 17:12-13). They place their countries and resources at his disposal, hoping for protection and prolongation of power, little realizing that it will last only for "one hour" (Rev. 17:12). They carry out his will in destroying the whore (Rev. 17:16-17), and march at last with the Beast to the battle of Armageddon and their own destruction (Rev. 19:19-21). With ruthless intent Antichrist climbs to one height after another on the fallen forms of his accomplices until at last he reaches his goal, sovereign rulership of the entire world (Rev. 13:3,7).

6. The Scriptures suggest that he will present a strong, attractive, physical appearance. The words "showing himself" of 2 Thess. 2:4 mean quite literally to show off or to make a public exhibition or display. The people shall see something in him, and it is what they see that impresses them. As a result the whole world of unregenerate men shall marvel at him, shall follow him, and shall worship him (Rev. 13:3,4; 17:8). These facts lead the Bible student to conclude that he will be an exceptional physical specimen, possessing not only a large, well-proportioned body, but also an attractive countenance, and an impressive appearance.

7. The foregoing qualities combine to make him the world's great military genius. He will demonstrate this in his rising military career. Astride a white charger, he goes forth conquering and to conquer, and equipped with a bow, he rides into one victory after another to capture and hold the crown he wears (Rev. 6:1-2). Red war, black famine, pale death, and religious persecution follow him, but his career is ever one of ascension. Even the wound unto death does not hinder his progress upward. For at last it is healed in such an amazing way that the peoples of earth cry out "Who is able to make war with him?" (Rev. 13:4).

8. This man then becomes the astonishment and wonder of the world. Differing from all others who have preceded him, possessing an amazing degree of high intelligence, demonstrating himself among men as no other demagogue before him, displaying an insight into the abstruse areas of human thought, cleverly manipulating the political strings of society, winning a following by his massive frame and attractive face, and in his military campaigns across the world, even defying death, he becomes the latest wonder of the world (Rev. 13:3-4). Yet beneath this glittering exterior is the nature of a beast, a wild beast who knows no law but the law of his own desire (Rev. 13:1; 2 Thess. 2:3-4).

IV. THE RELIGION AND MORAL CHARACTER OF ANTICHRIST

All that is good in mankind will come to its fruition in this man. Yet all of this will be turned to carry out the purposes of Hell because this man will be the very incarnation of human sin, pride, arrogance, rebellion, and unholy ambition.

1. In religion, this man will be a materialistic pantheist (2 Thess. 2:3-4). A religious rebellion prepares the way for his appearance in society. Basically this philosophy is pantheistic, denying the transcendence of God and asserting that creation is the total of reality. Once this

philosophy permeates society, this great man appears on the scene and demands the worship belonging to deity.⁶ This consists in the deification of the natural level, the enthronement of physical forces, the obliteration of moral and spiritual distinctions, and the inauguration of the wildest outbreak of physical violence, moral corruption, and spiritual degeneracy the world has ever seen. Opposition to God and the exaltation of self above all that is called God or that is worshipped can lead in no other direction.

2. In expression, this man will be a blasphemer on an extraordinary scale. He wears the name of blasphemy (Rev. 13:1), is given a mouth to speak blasphemy (Rev. 13:5), gives expression to blasphemy (Rev. 13:6), and exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped (2 Thess. 2:4). Blasphemy originates from two sources: one is intellectual and the other is moral. It consists in the affirmation of untruth about God or the things of God for the purpose of injuring. In the case of this man, it would appear that the source is wholly moral, namely, hatred for God and the desire to injure Him and all who are associated with Him. Dispassionately, deliberately he denies the truth about God (1 John 2:22; 4:3; 11 John 7).

3. In character, this man is the greatest antinomian of all humanity. He is described by Paul as "that man of sin" or "that Wicked" (2 Thess. 2:3, 8). Both of these expressions represent the Greek words which means "the lawless one." At last, the mystery of lawlessness produces its fruit in this man (2 Thess. 2:7). Sin is lawlessness (1 John 3:4 ASV). But through the centuries there has been a certain restraint placed upon it, in that the Holy Spirit of God has exercised through God's people a hindrance to its full expression. But at last this restrainer, the Holy Spirit, will cease to operate since the Church in whom He dwells will have been translated (2 Thess. 2:6-7). Immediately this Lawless One will be revealed (2 Thess. 2:8). Being intolerant of all restraint, except the law of his own sinful desire, there will then begin the course and career of the most high-handed tyranny the world has ever seen.

4. In conduct, there will follow an almost unbelievable exhibition of selfish ambition. In the ultimate sense this will consist of at least four things. There will be a calculated and persistent course of opposition to God and all things associated with Him. Running parallel with this will be the claims to deity in his effort to exalt himself above God. To buttress his claims and achieve his end, there will be a carefully developed and executed system of demonstration to prove his claims. Finally, there will be the demands for worship and the compelling measures to bring this about. Opposition to God, exaltation above God, and demonstration of deity (2 Thess. 2:4, 9-11), can well be expected to culminate in the image to whom divine adoration must be paid, or suffer the penalty of death (Matt. 24:15; Rev. 13:14-17).

V. THE ORIGIN OF THE ANTICHRIST

A sevenfold origin of the Antichrist provides food for thought, though perhaps not all details can be insisted upon.

1. Out of the social chaos of the times, which provides an excellent opportunity for the strong man and savior of society, this man appears. He is described by John as rising up out of the sea (Rev. 13:1). If the waters are in any sense a picture of the troubled conditions of society (Rev. 17:15; Luke 21:25-26), then this is the opportunity for such a man to offer himself to the world.

When such men as Arnold Toynbee, noted British historian, are calling for the strong man, it would appear that the very conditions of the world are maneuvering to that end.

2. Out of a geographical division of the world represented by ten horns (Rev. 13:1; 17:3, 7, 12, 16) comes the beast. Equating this with Daniel 2, 7, and 8, it must be concluded that this man arises out of one of the divisions of Alexander's Empire, and this division must be that portion lying to the West on the continent of Europe.

3. In the political sense, this man is a citizen of that area which will eventually become the revived Roman Empire. This is the final Empire of Gentile civilization, that eventually swallows up all other great powers (Rev. 13:7). In the final period there will be given to the leader of this ten-horned Roman confederacy "power...over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations."

4. This raises the question concerning the national origin of Antichrist. Though there is by no means any decisive answer, there are suggestions that he must be a Jew. The absence of the tribe of Dan from the listing in Rev. 7:4-8 has been cited as proof, but it is doubtful whether this reasoning can be trusted. Speaking to His own people Jesus said, "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive" (John 5:43). Implicit in this is the appearance of one from their own nationality. Inasmuch as this one will enter into negotiations with Israel, suggesting confidence on their part, it is doubtful if any other than a Jew could so completely deceive them.

5. But there is a personal element in the origin of the Antichrist. This man is a member of the Satanic trinity (Rev. 16:13). He is commissioned of the Devil (Rev. 13:2), and energized and equipped by him (2 Thess. 2:9). But he is in every sense a man, that man whose greatness and moral disposition lends himself to a covenant with the Devil (Rev. 13:18). In Christ, the Devil found no answering response. But in this man he finds one who is ready to sell his soul and freedom for sovereignty over the world (Matt. 4:8-9; Luke 4:6-8).

6. The spiritual origin of this man must not be overlooked. He is the seed of the serpent (Gen. 3:15), but in that sense he is the product of the mystery of iniquity (2 Thess. 2:7 cf. 3, 8). Lawlessness having been initiated by Adam at the suggestion of Satan has been operating through the centuries. At last it reaches its fulness in this man. The pervading influence and power of sin not only provides the atmosphere and environment in which lawlessness can survive, but it actually molds and shapes a human personality into the measure and stature of itself.

7. There is finally the providential origin of the Man of Sin. To the countless millions of earth who have maneuvered themselves into the position of accepting a false Messiah by rejecting the true Christ, "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. 2:11). The definite article appears before the word "lie" in the original Greek. Antichrist is the lie, the masterpiece of Satan. Yet even this does not happen outside the providential movements of God in the unfolding of His plan. Christ works all things after the counsel of His own will (Eph. 1:11). Therefore it is reassuring to know that it is Christ who tears away the first seal that sends the Antichrist forth upon his mission of deception, persecution, and devastation (Rev. 6:1-2). This means that God is ultimately in control, even during that time of trouble such as the world has never seen.

VI. THE RISE OF THE ANTICHRIST TO WORLD POWER

1. The steps in the rise of the Antichrist to power can be summarized as follows. In general this order is correct, though there could be features that are out of place, and will be discovered only as prophesy unfolds in history.

(1) Immediately following the rapture of the Church, Antichrist will be revealed (2 Thess. 2:6-8 ASV). It is then that the restraining influence of the Holy Spirit as wrought through the Church will cease to operate. The first move on the part of Christ to take possession of earth is the release of Antichrist by the tearing away of the first seal (Rev. 6:1-2).

(2) Antichrist appears on the scene as an inconspicuous figure, but nevertheless, starting out upon a career "conquering and to conquer" (Rev. 6:1-2).

(3) He makes a treaty with the Jews in his own name (John 5:43), which brings them into possession of the temple area where they can renew their long discontinued worship (Rev. 11:1-3). What he gets in return from the Jews no one knows, though it is fairly certain that money figures in this move somewhere.

(4) Running parallel with negotiations with the Jews is the development of a ten-power confederacy that at last brings him into complete power (Rev. 13:1; 17:12-13).

(5) This ten-power confederacy results in world power by the middle of the seven-year tribulation period (Rev. 13:7). All other great powers fall before his march to world power. This includes the powers in the East and South, though perhaps the Northern power is removed from before him by the immediate judgment of God.

(6) Two mass movements to which he has submitted for three and one-half years finally result in a break and a change of plans. First, the false religious system of this time is no longer needed for he has reached supreme power throughout the world. So he destroys this system (Rev. 17:3, 16-17). Second, a movement of opposition among the Jews spearheaded by two witnesses is broken. With beast-like ferocity he slays the two witnesses (Rev. 11:3-13), and inaugurates the great tribulation against the Jews for the last three and one half years of this period (Rev. 11:2, 7), and extends it beyond to include millions of Gentiles who have believed on Christ (Rev. 7:9, 14). He now appears to be in undisputed control of the whole earth.

2. The means by which he has risen to world power are many.

(1) Chaotic world conditions, consisting of universal war, famine, pestilence, dislocation, and distress with no way out have provided an occasion (Matt. 24:6-7; Luke 21:25-26; Rev. 6:3-8).

(2) Great personal ability energized by Satan enabled him to gain recognition (Rev. 13:2-4; 2 Thess. 2:9).

(3) The material support from Jewish people, in return for religious privilege provides the material help (Rev. 11:1-3).

(4) In addition there is the influence and aid of apostate religion.

(5) Superhuman power communicated by Satan is especially important (2 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 13:2).

(6) Last but not least, is the divine permission and providential control from heaven. God sends the strong delusion in the person of Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:11), and it is Christ who holds the seven-sealed book in His hands and under His control and direction tears away the seal that sends Antichrist forth (Rev. 6:1-2).

3. The chronology of Antichrist's rise to power is clear as to order though not as to exact dates.

(1) The revelation of the Antichrist to the world comes immediately following the rapture of the Church (2 Thess. 2:7).

(2) The negotiations with Israel constitute the next major event (John 5:43), though perhaps this may not be the next event in time. But these negotiations mark the beginning of Daniel's seventieth week.

(3) Coronation as the supreme monarch of the world comes at the middle of this seventieth week of years (Rev. 13:7).

VII. THE PERIOD OF SUPREME WORLD POWER

1. The death of the two witnesses marks the breaking of the covenant with the Jewish nation and the beginning of world-wide persecution against the nation of Israel (Rev. 11:1-7; 12:6, 14; 13:7).

2. The temple worship now stopped, he deifies himself and demands that divine honors and worship be paid to him (2 Thess. 2:4; Rev. 13:14-15). He orders a huge image of himself made and moved into the temple area and divine honors paid to it (Rev. 13:14-15; Matt. 24:15). In the eyes of the godly Jew this constitutes the abomination of desolation.

3. By three different means he is able to secure universal worship for himself. By means of his great personal ability and attraction he arouses the hero-worship instinct of men (Rev. 13:3-4). He makes a personal display of superhuman powers such as causing fire to come down from heaven and making the image speak (Rev. 13:12-14). By means of economic and military sanctions he compels men under penalty of death to do him homage (Rev. 13:15-17). He is so successful that "all that dwell in the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life" (Rev. 13:8).

4. Since many of the Jews will resist him, he becomes the persecutor and prevails over them for three and one-half years (Rev. 11:2-3, 7; 12:6, 16; 13:5-7; Matt. 24:15, 21). So intense and

severe becomes this persecution, that if it were not for the immediate interference of the Lord in behalf of His people, they would be annihilated (Matt. 24:22).

5. At the very outset of this last three and one-half years, Antichrist destroys the apostate Church. Now that he has attained his goal, he no longer needs this false religious system. Under the direction of the ten confederated kings, her wealth is confiscated, her system is destroyed, her support is withdrawn (Rev. 17:16-17).

6. At last, this superman has reached the pinnacle of all earthly power, religious, economic, and military. All shall worship him (Rev. 13:8), none can buy or sell without his sanction (Rev. 13:17), and there is no one who is able to make war with him (Rev. 13:4).

7. At last, the ambition of Satan has been achieved in that creatures turn their worship toward him, and the proposal of Satan to Eve in the garden of Eden has been achieved, namely, "Ye shall be as gods" (Rev. 13:4), for men are now giving reverence to Antichrist as though he were God.

VIII. THE DOOM OF THE ANTICHRIST

1. The judgment of God upon the kingdom of Antichrist comes in two phases. The fifth angel poured out his bowl of wrath upon the throne of the Beast and his kingdom was full of darkness physically, morally and spiritually (Rev. 16:10-11). Though plagued with pain, the followers of the Beast gave evidence that they were confirmed in their sin and apostasy and therefore the fit subjects for final destruction. For they blasphemed the God of heaven. The great city Babylon, the center of the political and commercial interests of the world was destroyed (Rev. 18:1-24). In one hour this vengeance falls upon this city and is left an utter desolation. While this happens some time near the end of the seven years of tribulation, it is not the absolute end, for Antichrist yet organizes a campaign against Jerusalem, known as the battle of Armageddon (Rev. 16:12-16) at which time he is personally destroyed at the coming of Christ.

2. The rising pride and arrogance of this monarch leads him to plan a campaign against the Lamb of God himself (Rev. 17:14a; 19:19). It is possible that his return from death, or the healing of the death wound (Rev. 13:3), together with other exploits has given such overweening pride that he imagines now that he can ascend the heavens and defeat Christ. The remnant of Jews finding refuge in Jerusalem seems to him to be the first object of his hatred. So while in conflict with them, Christ breaks through the clouds of heaven on His white charger and streams toward the center of conflict. With the sword of his mouth (Rev. 19:15), His almighty word, he breaks the power of Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:8). With the brightness of His coming, he demonstrates that Antichrist has deceived his followers, and he is deserted on the field of battle (2 Thess. 2:8), and all his armies are smitten into the dust (Rev. 19:21). Both the Beast and the False Prophet are taken alive and cast into the lake of fire forever (Rev. 19:20; 20:10). This brings his meteoric career to its end.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Pentecost, J. Dwight. Things to Come. Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958. P. 338.
Ryrie, C. C. Biblical Theology of New Testament. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959. P. 351.

2. McClain, A. J. The Greatness of the Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959. P. 453.
3. Pentecost. op. cit., p. 334. "The Bloody and Deceitful Man (Ps. 5:6), and Wicked One (Ps. 10:2-4), The Man of the Earth (Ps. 10:18), The Mighty Man (Ps. 52:1), The Enemy (Ps. 55:3), The Adversary (Ps. 74:8-10), The Head of Many Countries (Ps. 110:6), The Violent Man (Ps. 140:1), The Assyrian (Isa. 10:5-12), The King of Babylon (Isa. 14:2), The Sun of the Morning (Isa. 14:12), The Spoiler (Isa. 16:4-5; Jer. 6:26), The Nail (Isa. 22:25), The Branch of the Terrible Ones (Isa. 25:5), The Profane Wicked Prince of Israel (Ezek. 21:25-27), The Little Horn (Dan. 7:8), The Prince that shall Come (Dan. 9:26), The Vile Person (Dan. 11:21), The Willful King (Dan. 11:36), The Idol Shepherd (Zech. 11:16-17), The King of Fierce Countenance (Dan. 8:23), The Desolator (Dan. 9:27).
4. McClain, A. J. "Biblical Eschatology," (Unpublished notes), Grace Theological Seminary. Man that shall die (Ps. 51:12), The Terrible One (Isa. 29:20), "thy seed" (Gen. 3:15).
5. Andrews, S. J. Christianity and Antichristianity. Chicago: Moody Press, 1898. Pp. 251-263.
6. Ibid., pp. 119-168.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FUTURE LIFE. By Rene Pache. Translated by Helen I. Needham. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 376 pp. \$4.95.

Dr. Rene Pache, President of the Emmaus Bible School in Lausanne, Switzerland, is well known in American evangelical circles, having lectured in schools in this country.

This present volume is a sequel to his book on the "Return of Christ" published over a decade ago. Dr. Pache, although proficient in English, writes in his mother tongue, which is French. His books have made a major contribution to the premillennial and evangelical literature in French-speaking areas--France, Belgium and Switzerland. The influence of his writings has also been felt in French-speaking Africa, where reading believers and Bible students have so few evangelical helps on Biblical subjects. It is in these areas of Europe and Africa, where theological volumes following the premillennial interpretation of the Scriptures are sadly lacking, that Dr. Pache's works make their greatest contribution.

This book is not written for the American theological student who has access to well documented eschatological works in English which are furnished with indices of subjects and Scripture references. Its primary contribution in English will be to laymen, Sunday school teachers, and the like who will appreciate simplicity, conciseness and brevity.

This observation in no way depreciates the writings of Dr. Pache. He is a lawyer by training, having received his degree from Lausanne. He presents the truth in succinct and unequivocal language. Some of his pages are delightfully interesting.

It is not an easy task to translate a treatise such as this, but Miss Needham has done a commendable work. In many places the force of the original language is retained. For example, on page 323 where eternal perdition is considered as one of the most powerful motives to impel us

to preach the Gospel, he concludes with these words, "Let us surge forward along the paths marked out by William Carey, Hudson Taylor, John G. Paton, and the many other great pioneers, who were pushed irresistibly on by the call of the multitudes destined to eternal perdition." Also the phrase on page 324: "...to deliver man from the perdition where his sin is dragging him."

The book contains some very helpful outlines, e.g., the ministry of angels on page 107, and the names of Satan on page 121. The chapter on "The Occupation of the Dead," extending to thirty pages, is interesting and enlightening.

This should prove to be a very helpful volume for all who desire to have the doctrines of the future life presented in brief, clear and concise form.

ORVILLE D. JOBSON

Winona Lake, Indiana

HOLY GROUND. By Douglas M. White. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1962. 144 pp. \$2.50.

This is the second volume in the Evangelical Pulpit Library. The author, pastor of First Baptist Church in Bassett, Virginia, has done a fine job of presenting and applying the spiritual truths contained in the historical portions of the Book of Exodus.

It's a gem. I strongly suspect that the material in this book has been preached; if not, it is nevertheless preachable. The flavor of the book is pastoral, and intensely practical. Unlike many theological books, this one could...and should...be read by lay people.

Much deep truth is presented, but it is also clear as a Bahama sea. Paragraphs are short, well-written in "Americanese," and demonstrate real effort in study on the part of the author. Illustrations are homey and apt, such as this one about Pharaoh's desire that the Israelites leave their

cattle in Egypt while they went to worship: "If a man leaves his cows in Egypt it will only be a matter of time before he will be back in the stable himself."

The author makes good use of poetry, which is freely interspersed. Verse selected is simple, well-chosen, and spiritually excellent.

Another help is the outlining of the chapters into sensible and thoughtful sections. The topics consist of the very words of the Scripture. This is not a verse-by-verse exposition, but a demonstration of the movement from "Out of the Water" (Chapter I) to a place "In the Top of the Mount" (Chapter XII).

A few technical errors were noted. Some words misspelled were "devine" on p. 21, "bares" on p. 89, and "superceded" on p. 137. Also, on p. 116 the last two lines of type are reversed.

Some day I hope to write a book like this.

DEAN RISSE

Margate, Florida

HANDBOOK OF PREACHING RESOURCES FROM ENGLISH LITERATURE. by James Douglas Robertson. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1962. 268 pp.

This book should provide an excellent source book for those whose sermons are characterized by sameness, resulting in dullness. Most ministers have very little background in good literature and especially English literature. This book is a compilation of quotations, illustrations and poems arranged according to subject as well as author and sources. I heartily recommend it as a valuable reference work in providing "windows" for sermons.

Some of the authors quoted are Shakespeare, Chaucer, Kipling, Bunyan, Dickens and Browning as well as some more recent writers such as C.S.

Lewis and T.S. Eliot. The practical value of the choice of material is commendable.

GLENN O'NEAL

Talbot Theological Seminary

TREASURE IN EARTHEN VESSELS. By James M. Gustafson. Harper & Brothers, New York. 141 pp., \$3.50.

Gustafson, Yale Divinity School associate professor in social ethics, has produced an allegedly nontheological ecclesiological study based on "the light of social thought." Main emphasis is on "the church as a human community"; not as the body of Christ. Gustafson disregards the spiritual role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the church, considering Jesus Christ as a mere "totem symbol" of the Christian community (p. 44).

Chapters 1-3--dealing with the church as a human, natural and political community--are the best part of the book. Those topics are readily adaptable to sociological investigation. The last five chapters show a conflict between Gustafson's religious and social philosophy, especially so in chapters 7 and 8.

Treasure in Earthen Vessels is a pedantic compendium of subjective impressions cloaked in intellectual jargon that is often dull. The church organization described by Gustafson is an earthen vessel but not a treasure. This book shows that as the body of Christ the church cannot be defined satisfactorily in sociological platitudes. Gustafson also demonstrates that the study he undertook cannot eliminate theology completely. Nor can Christ be shut out!

Borrowed from 2 Corinthians 4:7, the title, in view of the Bible context, is a misapplication of Scripture designed to sell a manuscript to a publisher, probably, and to catch the public eye. The three-page index to the book is quite superficial from these angles: Many important topics

discussed in detail in scattered parts of the book are ignored in the index. Other subjects are listed with only single page references. Often the index page references reveal scanty discussion of the topic concerned whereas longer treatment is not indicated in the index.

Absence of even a brief selected bibliography diminishes the value of Gustafson's study. One has to thumb through tedious footnotes to discover the books the author refers to in his book. Even so, titles mentioned in the footnotes consistently omit publisher names, so that readers seeking to track down Gustafson's references could have research problems.

BENJAMIN A. HAMILTON
Grace Theological Seminary

COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Lester DeKoster. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 158 pp. \$3.50.

Here is a useful and valuable introduction to the subject. The book has several strengths. It sketches the life of Marx; it uses an analogy that describes the rudiments of the conflict; it shows the folly of trying to refute the Marxists' arguments on their own ground; and it offers a sound comparison between Christianity and Communism as religions. In addition, the book offers a reading list which serves as a helpful guide to any further study of the subject.

Probably the most serious weakness of the book is its presupposition, Reformed theology. Its section on a Christian social order draws far more from Augustine and Calvin than from the Apostles Paul and John. The book views Christian anti-Communism more in terms of the Golden Rule than in terms of the Great Commission. It shows the kinship between Marxist materialism and capitalist materialism but hesitates to make a biblical application.

Some of its suggestions deserve serious thought, however. Our food surpluses in the

presence of a starving world are indeed a scandal. Again, the believer had better remember that his anti-Communism has little in common with popular anti-Communism. On balance, the book is worth buying.

ROBERT G. DELNAY
Central Conservative Baptist Seminary

THE SHEPHERD OF THE STARS. By Charles A. Trentham. Broadman Press, Nashville, 1962. 172 pp., \$2.95.

The author of this book is the dean of the School of Religion of the University of Tennessee. His book is a commentary in the popular style on the Colossian epistle. It seeks to make an appeal to the modern mind by comparing our space-age problems and perplexities with the elaborate angelology of first century Colosse. The two periods are said to be similar since both are concerned with what lies beyond the limits of earth. This comparison may be a trifle overdrawn, especially when a supporting argument that is used is that Colosse was soon to be destroyed by an earthquake, and our civilization is likewise threatened by nuclear destruction. The comparison is hardly valid, since the citizens of Colosse were utterly oblivious to the impending disaster and this can hardly be compared to our society, which is all-too-conscious of the fearful possibilities of war. However, little space is devoted to this analogy, and the 28 brief expository chapters are well worth reading.

The book, while not attempting to explain every verse, nevertheless does not avoid all the difficult passages. Especially lucid are the explanations of 1:15 and 1:19 (the "firstborn" and "fulness" passages).

The author's scholarship is evident throughout, but his use of technical language and Greek words is never that which would discourage the untrained reader. There is an especially good chapter on the Christian use of music and another upon the relation of forms and ordinances to true worship.

Perhaps the chief value of the work is its wealth of fresh illustrative material. The minister will find here many usable quotations which will aid in his sermon preparation.

WENDELL E. KENT

Roanoke, Virginia

CHRIST IN YOU. An Exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians. By Herschel H. Hobbs. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1961. 128 pp., \$2.50.

In this work the author compares the Apostle Paul to a general whose aim is to defeat the enemy (Gnosticism in this case) and emerge with a victorious army that can never be defeated. The first four chapters he devotes to an exposition of Paul's initial "sword-thrusts" against the enemy. He then proceeds, by careful exegesis, to show Paul's efforts as a wise warrior to repair the damage already done to his ranks by the false teachings of Gnosticism. Having then rallied his forces, Paul is pictured as directing his "troops" through maneuvers in both war and peace, thus demonstrating the need for true soldiers for Christ at all times.

Hobb's work shows evidence of careful research and clear understanding of the original language. As the first volume in a proposed series of small commentaries called "The Evangelical Pulpit Library," this work is an excellent beginning.

WENDELL E. KENT

Roanoke, Virginia

IS CHRIST DIVIDED? by Lesslie Newbigin. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1961. 41 pp. A FAITH FOR THIS ONE WORLD? by Lesslie Newbigin. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1962. 128 pp. \$2.75.

As the titles of these two little books make clear, Bishop Newbigin's burden is that the church

divided is a contradiction in terms, that the unity spoken of by the Lord Jesus must be realized concretely. In accordance with his view of the unity of the church, he is serving, after many years as a bishop of the Church in South India, as General Secretary of the International Missionary Council.

Certain things must be made clear from the start. As far as this reviewer is concerned, the reality of Newbigin's faith and commitment are not open to question. Nor do we dare minimize the problem to which he addresses himself, nor the cogency of many of his arguments. However much we may disagree with him (as this reviewer does), this man deserves a hearing.

Is Christ Divided? is a sort of expanded tract. In four brief chapters, based upon John 12:32, John 17:22-23, and Mark 13:6-10, Newbigin argues passionately for the universality of the gospel appeal, but points out that the appeal is muted by the scandal of division. On the analogy of a world of shrinking dimensions, he shows that "propinquity is not unity." Only in Christ is there a real unity. A "body" is not an "ideal or metaphorical" thing, but must be visible. Separation on the basis of the teaching of men is the sin of the carnal Corinthians. "These divisions are contrary to His will," and "we must repent of them." "Being children of God must mean being--in some recognizable sense--members of one family" (italics ours). "The Church's mission to the nations is the clue to the real meaning of world history," but it demands a unified church.

The same message, but presented in an entirely different manner, is found in A Faith for this One World? Since it is an amplification of the William Belden Noble Lectures (Harvard, 1958), the booklet is scholarly and extremely well-written. In the first chapter ("The End of Christendom and the Rise of a World Civilization"), he points out that while peoples all over the world are rebelling against domination by Western political powers and Western philosophy, they are simultaneously adopting Western technology to a degree that is shaping a new world civilization.

He says, very aptly, "For many in the East the West stands for three things: war, sex and technicals." The implication (made clear later) is that the Christian Church must divorce its message from political, cultural, or social paternalism based upon a concept of Western superiority.

He then examines three non-Christian attempts to find a faith for this new world, and finds them all wanting. Radhakrishnan's search for the core value of all existing religions in the area of mystical experience ends up by being rather "the negative unity of tolerance than the positive unity of love." Toynbee's view, according to which man must choose the good parts of his multiple religious heritage, is inadequate because it places human reason in the position of final arbiter, and Hocking's attempt to find (somewhat after the manner of some neo-orthodox thinkers) a dimension for the acts of God outside history is likewise the concept of a unique revelation.

In two magnificent chapters on Authority ("The Presuppositions of Christ's Revelation" and "The Content of Christ's Revelation") Newbigin finds the authority for Christianity's claims to uniqueness and universality in the doctrine of creation, the doctrine of sin ("mankind is a fallen race...It requires nothing less than a rebirth, the creation of a new nature, to recognize...light."), and the doctrine of election (not only to "privilege but to responsibility."). Clearly stated and defended are all the historic Biblical doctrines of the Church: The Deity, Virgin Birth, Vicarious Death, Bodily Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, and so on. The whole is one of the finest brief summaries of the Christian faith that I know of.

The implications of all this for missions are that the uniqueness of the Gospel and its universality demand a unified Church. Also, on practical grounds, Newbigin thinks that the only way in which young churches on the mission field will ever attain local autonomy in fact as well as in claim is in a situation where the old dual relationship of sending-church to receiving-church is

replaced by a cooperative body where all sending churches and receiving churches meet in equality and in a common cause.

It is easy to pick holes. While presenting his own faith with moving simplicity and complete soundness, Newbigin leaves unanswered the problem of doctrinal deviation in bodies related to the World Council. After saying that organizational unity is not the major consideration, he makes the tacit assumption that it is in fact a very important thing. One could go on. But in doing so, would one have finished the job? It is easy to be negative, but incumbent on us to be positive. We can recite ad nauseam what we do not believe about the unity of the Church, but can we so clearly state what we do believe? Is our conception merely more of the same, but with doctrinal positions defined more carefully, or is it something new? It is high time evangelicals addressed this problem constructively, not in platitudes which break down in real situations, but in concrete terms.

CHARLES TABER

Hartford, Connecticut

THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT. (Selected writings) by Roland Allen. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 208 pp., \$1.65 (paper).

To those familiar only with Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours? it may come as a surprise to learn that Roland Allen wrote eleven books, ten pamphlets, and thirty-two published articles. The present volume contains, in whole or in part, seven selections.

In Pentecost and the World, Allen shows the primacy of the Holy Spirit in the book of Acts, the missionary thrust of His ministry, the missionary impulse He created within men, and so forth. The best portions are those in which Allen deals with the Holy Spirit as the source and test of new forms of missionary activity, and the gift of the Spirit as the sole test of communion.

In another brief selection, Allen argues for a non-professional ministry. He feels that in spite of all disclaimers, present-day missionaries are professionals. But this, he says, is dangerous, for "The missionary group as such absorbs far too much of the missionary spirit of the church," by which he means that other members feel absolved from personal responsibility. Every Christian should accept his position as a missionary within his station in life rather than as a distinct professional activity.

Again writing of the work of the Holy Spirit, Allen pleads against the regarding of human means (what we would call "organization" and "gimmicks") as de facto substitutes for the Holy Spirit. On the one hand, this places an undue pressure on the financial resources of the church, and on the other hand it perpetuates the foreignness of the church on the mission field. He rightly insists that the church must "be absolutely native and obviously and unmistakable free from our control—not in our speech, but in the eyes of every native."

One of the longer and more important selections is The Case for Voluntary Clergy. Here Allen argues that the entire system of paid, full-time church workers grew up in prosperous, settled churches, and is not suitable on the mission field. When only such men are ordained as meet our artificial standards and can be supported by the church, there are too few ministers to serve the needs of people in poorer areas. Thus we see "parishes" covering such huge areas that no man can effectively serve them. There are purely administrative fictions and monstrosities, hiding the fact that the church is actually doing nothing in large areas. Allen's solution is to ordain many men, applying only New Testament standards. There would then be in each local group of believers a number of men ordained for the work of the ministry, but not paid by the churches. There is much to be said for this position, at least as regards the need for more ordained leaders. But not enough recognition is given to the New Testament teaching on the support of worthy ministers.

In making an overall evaluation, one should recognize an ambivalence in Allen's thinking. On one hand, he is clearly influenced by his Anglican background, but on the other hand he in many places breaks out of this limiting condition to such an extent that he is no less than revolutionary. Again, in his time (approximately 1910-1930) he was so prophetic and visionary that almost no one heard him. He himself told his son that he would not be understood nor appreciated until 1960, and he was not far wrong. The truth of his main theses has been demonstrated in many ways. But he also was limited by his time, in that he failed to foresee such modern developments as nationalism and the rise of new independent states. Allen cannot of course be condemned for not seeing these things; he deserves rather to be highly commended for what he did see that no one else saw. But these limitations do make Allen's work less than infallible. Some things he has not dealt with, or has dealt with inadequately.

One such area is that of the individual missionary's relationships with the indigenous church as a person. Allen rightly emphasized the fact that domination by the missionary was detrimental, and argued that the missionary should not be in a position to stifle local initiative. But this purely negative emphasis resulted in the missionary's being totally excluded from the local church. This might do on a very temporary basis. But some more adequate positive statement of the relationship needs to be worked out in the actual situation.

If one keeps in mind this kind of omission or weakness, which is characteristic of Allen's work, this book is to be highly recommended. One must only remember to be guided by Allen in the light of present situations as they really are rather than as they were in his day.

CHARLES TABER

Hartford, Connecticut

THE BIBLE, RELIGION, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. By Donald E. Boles, Iowa State University Press, 1961.

In our country, the matter of the relationship of church and state has seemingly always revolved around the matter of public education. Many Christians are concerned about such problems as federal aid and Bible reading in the public school systems of America, but few are really informed on the historical background of these problems. Here is a book that traces the controversy over religion in the public schools from the days of Colonial America to contemporary trends in the early sixties.

Donald E. Boles is associate Professor of Government at Iowa State University in Ames. While no evangelical, he is a competent historian who presents the facts and lets them stand or fall on their own merits. Indeed, unlike many historians, Boles reserves his own interpretation of the facts until the last few paragraphs of the book. One very valuable item is the thorough documentation of court cases and decisions which serve as precedents in disputes over the Bible in public schools. Twenty-five pages of such documentation are included at the rear of the book. The indication of contemporary trends given in chapter eight is a lucid analysis of "where we now stand." The distinctions between Roman Catholics, Jews, and Protestants are clearly drawn as specific quotations and writings are referred to.

But what of the relevance of this book to evangelical Christians? No parent, pastor or educator can afford to be passive in regard to the issues which are raised in this book. These matters affect voting, preaching, educational philosophy and parental relations to the local school system. Although many will not agree with the author's final conclusion (as this reviewer does not), yet we cannot overlook the pertinence of the arguments presented on both sides. The enlightened Christian public can serve God and

country far more adequately than can the uninformed.

KENNETH O. GANGEL
Calvary Bible College

HOLDING FAST TO GRACE. By Roy L. Aldrich. Dunham Publishing Co., Findlay, Ohio. 94 pp., \$2.00.

Holding Fast to Grace is from the pen of the distinguished president of Detroit Bible College. The book deals with the believer's relationship to law and grace. It clearly shows that just as the law cannot save, neither can it sanctify. The believer is delivered from the entire Mosaic system, including the Ten Commandments. In this regard, the writer makes some necessary distinctions between the eternal, moral law of God and the Ten Commandments. Various chapters deal with such interesting subjects as: "Confusion of Law and Grace," "The Law of Moses a Unit," "The Mosaic Law Done Away," "The Nature of the Moral Law" and others.

Some interesting features of the book are as follows: It is well written, with helpful documentation for those interested in the writer's sources of information. Dr. Aldrich has the ability to state his case clearly and to the point. For that reason, the book is less than 100 pages in length, and therein lies one of its values; it can be placed into the hands of laymen who have problems regarding legalism.

The first chapter is of a devotional nature, showing how freedom from the law has a practical effect upon the Christian's life. There are at least two illustrations in this section well worth the price of the book.

Holding Fast to Grace is a welcomed addition to this reviewer's library.

ROBERT K. SPRADLING
Northville, Michigan

THE LATTER DAYS. By Russell Bradley Jones. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1960. 196 pp., \$2.95.

Russell Bradley Jones is a convinced amillennial. This book, which was originally issued in 1947 under the title, "The Things Which Shall Be Hereafter," is the fruit of his "determined attempt, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to learn as much as he could about the predictive Scriptures."

To achieve this goal he felt it necessary to investigate: 1. The chief principle of predictive interpretation, 2. The identity of the chosen people of God's future, and 3. The consummating purpose of Christ.

These he resolves in typical amillennial fashion. E.g. "The so-called spiritual principle of interpretation, rather than the literal principle, is correct and has the witness of apostolic practice." "The eternal people of God are not the natural seed of Abraham, but his spiritual seed, Christ and His blood-bought, born-again people of all races." "These have become heirs through faith to all the promises and have superseded natural Israel, which as a nation has been finally and fully rejected." "The consummating purpose of Christ is realized in the Kingdom of His dear Son, in Christ's victory over sin, in His spiritual reign now in redeemed hearts, and finally in universal triumph." "Millennialism...has no place in the correct interpretation of the Bible."

There is much in this book that is highly commendable. The author's high view of the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture and his insistence upon the necessity of salvation by grace through faith alone for all men are very refreshing. Unfortunately, some of the other features of the book are not.

In the light of his avowed purpose in writing, it seems irreconcilable that Dr. Jones should pass over with complete silence the great volume of scripture that deals with the restoration of Israel

and her millennial glory. (See Lev. 26:42-45; Is. 11:1-12 Jer. 26:5-8; Jer. 31:35-37 etc.)

His charge that, "If...the literalists are right...the way is left open for any sort of manipulation of the predictions that may appeal to the interpreter," seems, to this reviewer, to be a charge that could be leveled, with much more justification, at those who would spiritualize.

Particularly unfortunate is his suggestion that Premillennialism is the product of the union of the Judaizers and the Jesuits.

All things considered, The Latter Days is a clear, comprehensive, and cogent presentation of the amillennial position. If that's what you are after, this is the book for you.

ROBERT G. ZIMMER

Syosset, N. Y.

COMMUNISM, ITS FAITH AND FALLACIES. By James D. Bales. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1962. 214 pp. \$3.95.

This volume meets a need for a simple, straightforward discussion of the philosophy and fallacies of international communism written from a conservative Christian viewpoint. After defining communism and describing its philosophic orientation, Dr. Bales, professor of Bible at Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, shows the antithesis of the communist doctrine to Biblical theism. He traces the development of dialectical and historical materialism. The communists believe that change is inevitable, irresistible and progressive. They do not feel that peaceful coexistence is perpetual. Their dialectical philosophy allows them to use subversion, racial minorities, youth groups and semantic sabotage as legitimate tools in carrying out their purposes in conquering the world.

Following evidence that the dialectic is not the key to reality, Dr. Bales presents the communist concept of class and class struggle, the

communist doctrine of revolution, and the communist attitude toward religion. He states that communism is militant atheism and a totalitarian system which demands the complete loyalty of its subjects. Communism maintains that religion is a tool of the ruling class for the perpetuation of its power and the control of the masses. Communism is against any religion which teaches the reality of moral law. It fights religion with anti-religious propaganda and physical persecution and wherever possible seeks to use its organizations and leaders in the accomplishment of communistic ends.

After a brief but helpful description of the communist doctrine of morality and the communist party itself, the author summarizes the basic concepts of communism as follows:

First, atheism. Secondly, dialectical materialism. Thirdly, that all things are in a state of change, i.e., nothing is absolute, all is relative. Fourthly, the class nature of all social institutions, ideals, ideas, morality, religion and laws. Fifthly, the irreconcilability of the class interests of the capitalists and of the proletariat. Sixthly, the necessity of revolution. Seventhly, the necessity and absolute supremacy of the Communist Party. Eighthly, the inevitability of Communism.

He concludes that a communist is a communist and that he will act like a communist. We should never expect him to act like a Christian.

The book is a well documented introduction to the study of communism and could be used with profit by individuals or groups who are interested in beginning a serious study of the faith and fallacies of this growing but godless political philosophy.

RICHARD T. MCINTOSH

Cedarville College

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By F. F. Bruce. Fleming H. Revell Company. Westwood, New Jersey, 1961. 140 pp., \$3.00.

This verse-by-verse exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians is written by one of the leading Biblical scholars of Britain. It is a book which should prove illuminating and stimulating to anyone interested in a deeper understanding of this Epistle by Paul.

The author states in the preface that the book "is intended for the general Christian reader who is interested in serious Bible study, not for the professional or specialist student." To that end, Greek words and phrases, though occurring frequently, are clearly explained. Other matters of a more critical nature are dealt with lightly.

The first section of this book deals with introductory materials such as author, time and place of writing, etc. Included is a section entitled "For Further Study" in which the author lists other references which he feels will be useful in the study of the Epistle. Most of these are by English authors, however.

Bruce divides the text of the Epistle into two divisions--as most expositors do. Chapters 1-3 are titled "The New Community in the Purpose of God;" chapters 4-6, "The New Community in the Life of the Believers." A very helpful index will be found in the back of the book.

Though this is not a long exposition, this reviewer found it to be one of the finest he has read on Ephesians. There is no question but that the author is at home in the original language and has thoroughly studied all of Paul's writings. It is my conviction that this book will be a most valuable addition to any library.

STEPHEN C. DEARBORN

DOOYEWEERD AND THE AMSTERDAM PHILOSOPHY. By Ronald Nash. Zondervan Pub. House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 109 pp., \$2.50.

This book by the philosophy instructor at Houghton College has two self-confessed purposes. One is to introduce Dooyeweerd to new readers, particularly in non-Calvinistic circles. The other is to form a "bridge" between past and future, more definitive expositions of Dooyeweerd's thought.

The author states that Dooyeweerd's philosophy rests on two basic presuppositions: that the Sovereign God has established laws in regular order in His creation, known as the cosmic law order; that scientific thought has non-scientific presuppositions which are religious in nature. Unprejudiced thought doesn't exist. Dooyeweerd finds the proper starting point in philosophy in the heart of man, that no heart is neutral but either worships the Creator or a part of the creation. He contends that all philosophies that have their starting point in theoretical thought or autonomous reason itself are guilty of deifying some aspect of creation above the others, and that only the heart of man affords the proper vantage point from which to view the cosmos.

The cosmic law order consists of fifteen law spheres beginning with the Numerical Aspect which is the simplest and concluding with the Pistical Aspect (faith) which is the most complex. Each sphere is sovereign, having its own irreducible laws and nature which cannot be transferred to another sphere. It is when this sovereignty of the spheres is invaded that contradictions or antinomies arise.

Mr. Nash presents Dooyeweerd's philosophy in highly simplified form and points out some of the difficulties and seeming contradictions he finds in it. The last chapter is devoted to the contributions of Dooyeweerd as well as some objections. The first objection is against Dooyeweerd's vagueness and ambiguity of language.

The reviewer knows of one prominent philosopher who has given up in despair of making any sense out of Dooyeweerd.

An excellent bibliography on the Philosophy of the Idea of Law is given at the end. Dooyeweerd is a name to be reckoned with in contemporary philosophy and this volume is strongly recommended as a simplified introduction and analysis.

ROLLAND McCUNE

Winamac, Indiana

THE VACATION BIBLE SCHOOL IN THE LOCAL CHURCH. By Gene A. Getz. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 158 pp., \$2.95.

From several years of practical experience, Mr. Getz, a faculty member at Moody Bible Institute makes an interesting contribution to a needy field, leadership in the Vacation Bible School (VBS). The dual purpose of this book is to serve as a text or supplementary guide in Christian education of Bible colleges and to be a text for personnel who will conduct a VBS in the local church. With freshness, clarity, and simplicity the author takes the reader through the stages of planning, leading, and following-up of a VBS. A vital relationship to the ministry of the church is stressed. Pastors, Christian Education directors, musicians, teachers and general workers are all encouraged to serve and their duties are outlined. The book is written with organizations of all numerical sizes in mind. The author writes as if all churches could have a VBS and each church should have a successful program. Throughout the book, valuable suggestions are given for the small church.

Part III, entitled "Preliminary Planning" is considered the best part of the book. This section deals with the direct responsibilities of the VBS Planning Committee. If carefully followed,

these plans will eliminate much of the haphazard organization and leadership of the average school. Among the check lists provided, these are especially helpful: (1) Spiritual Qualifications For All Personnel (pp. 57, 58) to obtain competent leadership; (2) Curriculum Criteria (pp. 59-61) to analyze VBS materials; (3) VBS Calendar (pp. 49-52) to serve as a time and activity guide. In other parts of the book, an actual program for a day of VBS is carefully outlined (Part V). The dedication service (p. 93) and the proposed evaluation session are profitable ideas. The author demonstrates his practical knowledge of people by several cautions and suggestions, e.g. the older young people are never required to march in the daily parade. Everyone who is interested in VBS will appreciate Appendix I, "Summary Charts of Age Group Characteristics and Suggestions" quoted from another author. Appendix II is a list of VBS publishers and a short summary of their courses.

The titles of the Table of Contents are concise and in keeping with the theme of the book, but the titles of List of Charts could be fuller for rapid comprehension. Many church groups are emphasizing Scripture memorization with part or complete elimination of craft time. A successful VBS can be conducted in less time than proposed. Often the manual work and recreation time are used as escape instruments for unprepared teachers. The reviewer suggests a short section or appendix on how to lead a soul to Christ and key verses for soul-winning. A careful study of this book will revise many poorly organized and feebly managed Vacation Bible Schools.

JAMES H. GABHART

Winona Lake, Indiana

THE REFORMATION: A REDISCOVERY OF GRACE. By Wm. Childs Robinson. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962.

The subject of this review is what its title purports it to be, namely, a setting forth of the

Protestant Reformation in its true character. The author, who is a conservative scholar teaching in a conservative theological seminary, relives for his readers the exciting experiences of the sixteenth century when such men as Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon, Calvin, Knox and a host of others carried the torch for a return to a simple New Testament doctrine and practice against an empty ecclesiastical externalism.

In seven lucid chapters Dr. Robinson reveals the heart of the Protestant movement. In Chapter One he deals with five of the main slogans of the movement--Sola Gratia, Sola Christo, Sola Fide, Sola Scriptura and Soli Deo Gloria--showing clearly that the reformers emphasized that salvation is by grace alone, that righteousness is achieved solely through the work of another, even the Lord Jesus Christ by His substitutionary work at Calvary, that it is alone by faith that Christ is received and His salvation possessed, that all glory for this saving ministry belongs to God, and that it is only by the faithful exposition of the written Word of God that the Holy Spirit brings this Gospel to man.

In Chapter Two the Significance of the Reformation is dealt with, namely, that there was a need for a new discovery of God. He had been lost in all the maze of ceremony, liturgy, sacramentalism, tradition, works, etc., that had been imposed upon the church. The Reformation sought to restore the simple Gospel message of New Testament times and thus there was a new discovery of God. In Chapter Three the Gospel of the Reformation is discussed. It is the Gospel of the Grace of God apart from the works of the law. In it Christ shines forth as the all-sufficient Prophet, Priest and King. Chapter Four deals with The Article of the Reformation, namely, the doctrine of justification by faith. In Chapter Five The Theologian of the Reformation is pictured. He is none other than John Calvin. He is set forth both as a Biblical theologian and a faithful interpreter of Scripture.

In Chapters Six and Seven, respectively, The Instrument of the Reformation, namely, the Word

of God and The Root and Fruit of the Reformation, which is the Evangelical Church, are discussed, each in its own significant sequence.

Throughout the book there are many quotations from the Reformers which aid the reader in determining just what these men believed. There is also a liberal usage of modern scholarship which helps to reveal the debt which the true evangelicalism of today owes to the defenders of the faith in the sixteenth century. The book is amply documented.

Here is a production of special importance for this day when there is so much talk about ecumenicity and when even the Roman Catholic hierarchy is re-evaluating its heritage with an eye toward unification of all branches of Christendom. We need to better understand our spiritual legacy and to be assured that what the Reformers bequeathed to us is worth contending for. The hearts of the true descendants of the Reformation movement will be warmed and thrilled by this book of solid research and direct appeal.

HOMER A. KENT, SR.

Grace Theological Seminary

THE SOLE SUFFICIENCY OF JESUS CHRIST.
By Herbert W. Cragg. Marshall, Morgan, & Scott. London, 1961. 110 pp., \$2.50.

The author of this attractive little volume on the Epistle to the Colossians is vicar of Christ Church in Beckenham, England. The material was first presented at the Keswick Convention of 1960.

These concise studies make excellent devotional reading, and provide a clear insight to the structure and theme of the epistle. It was not the author's purpose to deal exhaustively with the text nor to delve deeply into problem passages. Yet the brief outlines serve well as an introduction to the contents.

The volume will be a real aid to Christian workers for such uses as prayer meeting talks and other devotional meetings, as well as for private meditation.

HOMER A. KENT, JR.

Grace Theological Seminary

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE EMPIRICAL THEOLOGY OF HENRY NELSON WIEMAN. Ed. by Robert W. Bretall. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 423 pp., \$8.50.

GOOD NEWS: Thoughts on God and Man. By J. B. Phillips. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 210 pp., \$2.95.

SERMONS TO INTELLECTUALS. By Franklin H. Littell. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. 160 pp., \$3.95.

THE HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC PRAYER. Ed. by Roger Geffen. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. 204 pp., \$5.50.

NEW FRONTIERS IN THEOLOGY. (Vol. I) THE LATER HEIDEGGER AND THEOLOGY. Ed. by James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb, Jr. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 212 pp., \$4.50.

THE FINALITY OF FAITH. By Nels F. S. Ferre. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 115 pp., \$2.75.

THE PASTOR'S COUNSELING HANDBOOK. By James L. Christensen. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1963. 180 pp., \$3.95.

PREACHING WEEK BY WEEK. By David A. MacLennan. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1963. 158 pp., \$3.00.

REVELL'S BETTER CHURCH SERIES:

HOW TO RECRUIT AND KEEP SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS. By John R. Scottford.

HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR CHURCH OFFICE. By Clara Anness McCartt.

HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR CHURCH LIBRARY. By Alice Straughan.

HOW TO PUBLICIZE CHURCH ACTIVITIES. By William J. Barrows, Jr.

Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, New Jersey, 1962. 64 pp. each, \$1.00 each, paper.

TRIUMPHANT IN TROUBLE: STUDIES IN I PETER. By Paul S. Rees. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, New Jersey, 1962. 144 pp., \$3.00.

PROFITABLE BIBLE STUDY. By Wilbur M. Smith. Rev. Ed., W.A. Wilde Co., Natick, Mass., 1963. 166 pp., \$2.95.

ACTS, LIFE IN ACTION. By Roy L. Laurin. Dunham Publishing Company, Findlay, Ohio, 1962. 407 pp., \$4.50.

THE PSALMS of Sir Philip Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke. Edited with an introduction by J.C.A. Rathmell. Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1963. 362 pp., \$1.45, paper.

THE FAITH OF A HERETIC. By Walter Kaufmann. Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1963. 414 pp., \$1.45, paper.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, THE NEW CLARENDON BIBLE. By C. K. Barrett. Oxford University Press, New York, 1963.

THE ZONDERVAN PICTORIAL BIBLE DICTIONARY. Ed. by Merrill C. Tenney. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 927 pp., XXII maps.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION FOR THE LOCAL CHURCH. By H. W. Byrne. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 355 pp., \$5.95.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By W. Curry Mavis. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 155 pp., \$3.00.

FLESH AND SPIRIT. By William Barclay. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1962. 127 pp., \$2.00.

THE LETTERS TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES. By William M. Ramsay. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 446 pp., \$4.95, reprint.

THE TITHE IN SCRIPTURE. By Henry Lansdell. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 166 pp., \$2.95.

HOW WE GOT THE BIBLE. By Neil R. Lightfoot. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 128 pp., \$2.50.

CULTS AND ISMS. By Russell P. Spittler. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 143 pp., \$2.95.

EXPOSITORY PREACHING WITHOUT NOTES. By Charles W. Koller. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 132 pp., \$2.50.

ANOTHER LOOK AT SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM. By Norman F. Douty. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 224 pp., \$3.50.

WORDS AND WONDERS OF THE CROSS. By Gordon H. Girod. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 154 pp., \$2.50.

NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY: PHILIPPIANS. By William Hendriksen. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 218 pp., \$5.95.

THE HOME FRONT OF JEWISH MISSIONS. By Albert Huisjen. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 222 pp., \$3.95.

THE LAST JUDGMENT IN PROTESTANT THEOLOGY FROM ORTHODOXY TO RITSCHL. By James P. Martin. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 214 pp., \$4.00.

THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS. By Everett Lewis Cattell. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 103 pp., \$3.00.

A CONCISE EXEGETICAL GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By J. Harold Greenlee. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 3rd rev. ed., 82 pp. \$1.25, paper.

THE REFORMATION: A REDISCOVERY OF GRACE. By William Childs Robinson. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 189 pp., \$5.00.

THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT. By Roland Allen, ed. by David M. Paton. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. XVI & 208 pp., \$1.65, paper.

IN THE MIDST. By G. Don Gilmore. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 100 pp., \$2.50.

FOCUS, THE CRY FOR BREAD. By Anna J. Littell. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 153 pp., \$2.95.

INDEPENDENT BIBLE STUDY. By Irving L. Jensen. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 188 pp., \$3.50.

THE SPIRITUAL DILEMMA OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE. By Arthur W. Kac. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 128 pp., \$2.25.

HE CAME WITH MUSIC. By Helen Frazee-Bower. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 96 pp., \$1.95.

DANIEL. By Philip R. Newell. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 199 pp., \$3.00.

MY PURSUIT OF PEACE. By Dorothy H. Pentecost. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 253 pp., \$3.50.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Charles F. Pfeiffer. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 126 pp., \$.39, paper.

THE WYCLIFFE BIBLE COMMENTARY. Ed. by Charles F. Pfeiffer and Everett F. Harrison. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 1525 pp., \$11.95.



GRACE JOURNAL

A PUBLICATION OF GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Winona Lake, Indiana

FALL 1963

Vol. 4

No. 3

GRACE JOURNAL

A publication of Grace Theological Seminary

VOLUME 4

FALL, 1963

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AGE	Harry A. Sturz	3
THE JEW	Bruce L. Button	16
"TO THIS AGREE THE WORDS OF THE PROPHETS"	Charles L. Zimmerman	28
BOOK REVIEWS		41
BOOKS RECEIVED		47

GRACE JOURNAL is published three times each year (Winter, Spring, Fall) by Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana.

EDITORIAL POLICY: The editors of GRACE JOURNAL hold the historic Christian faith, and accept without reservation the inerrancy of Scripture and the premillennial view of eschatology. A more complete expression of their theological position may be found in the Statement of Faith of Grace Theological Seminary. The editors, however, do not necessarily endorse every opinion that may be expressed by individual writers in the JOURNAL.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.00 per calendar year; single copy, 75c.

ADDRESS: All subscriptions and review copies of books should be sent to GRACE JOURNAL, Box 397, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Copyright, 1963, by Grace Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Editor

HERMAN A. HOYT
General Review Editor

JAMES L. BOYER
E. WILLIAM MALE
KENNETH G. MOELLER
Business Committee

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.
Managing Editor

S. HERBERT BESS
Book Review Editor

ALVA J. McCLAIN
HOMER A. KENT, SR.
PAUL R. FINK
Consulting Editors

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AGE

HARRY A. STURZ
Assistant Professor of Language
Biola College

In the extant writings of the Ante Nicene Fathers, there are quotations from all of the books of the New Testament. Of the twenty-six books, Matthew is by far the most frequently cited. Furthermore, the most frequently used portion of Matthew is that portion (chapters 5-7) now called "The Sermon on the Mount." Today, people who have little or no knowledge of the Bible or the contents of the Sermon on the Mount associate it with Jesus and seem to feel that its teaching is the guide for their lives. Most of us have probably had the experience of hearing an unregenerate person say something like the following: "Oh, I don't need to go to church, I believe in living by the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount." Someone has said that if the

proverbial visitor from Mars were to arrive in a characteristic Christian community, having read the Sermon on the Mount en route, he would be bewildered. The gulf between the pattern of the Sermon and the pattern of conventional Christian life is so great that the visitor would suspect he had read the wrong Sermon or visited the wrong community. Yet if he were to express this confusion to the members of the community he would find them bewildered at his bewilderment!¹

While the ethics of Jesus are not exhausted within the confines of the Sermon on the Mount (for example, it does not include His law of Love), nevertheless it is the most concentrated yet comprehensive portion of His ethical teaching. Because of this and because discussion of our Lord's ethics generally converges on the Sermon, this paper will also seek its material at this point. It is not so much the purpose of this paper to analyze the Sermon on the Mount itself as it is to survey the problem of the practical application of its precepts. There seems to be no questioning the fact that the ethics of our Lord as presented in the Sermon on the Mount have wielded a tremendous influence both within and without Christendom.

But how its moral content is to be integrated with the whole of biblical theology and ethics, on the one hand, and correlated with contemporary life, on the other, is a central problem.²

There are some who take the attitude of the famous archbishop of York, Dr. Magee, who once remarked that "a Christian State carrying out in all its relations literally the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount could not exist for a week," to which a Gifford lecturer appended the

comment that "as much could be said with equal truth of a Christian individual." There are others, however, who maintain that the Sermon is the only divinely-forged pattern of national and individual survival. In between these mutually exclusive views there is an array of interpretations all seeking to answer the problem of the application of the Sermon on the Mount.

In view of the fact that H. K. McArthur is able to delineate twelve different interpretations of the Sermon on the Mount, many of them radically differing from the others, one is inclined to agree with the observation that "the Sermon has had to put up with more opposition, distortion, dilution and emasculation than any other writing in the literature of the world."³ Even among those who are in general agreement as to the literal interpretation of Scripture and holding to the dispensational approach there are marked differences of opinion in this matter.

D. J. Pentecost points out that:

The Sermon on the Mount is one of three major discourses spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ in the discharge of His prophetic office while engaged in His ministry on earth. Concerning the Upper Room Discourse and the Olivet Discourse there is little divergence among Bible-believing interpreters as to the period of applicability, the persons addressed, or the principles of action contained in them. There is no such unanimity in the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, even among interpreters who approach Scripture from the same literal and dispensational viewpoint.⁴

In thinking of the age-relationship of the ethical teachings of Jesus, especially as concerns Matthew 5-7, it may be well to consider the remarks of L. D. Huber with respect to its being called a "Sermon."

What is a sermon anyway? (he asks) . . . Some note style, some content, some the situation, some the people involved; but all recognize that basically a sermon seeks in some way to influence conduct. Although the Sermon on the Mount hasn't always been called a sermon, its opening verse seems to suggest such a title; and Augustine so terms Matthew 5-7 in his Latin commentary . . . Actually, little is known of the circumstances surrounding Matthew 5-7, the setting of the sermon. Could it be that this material has been called a sermon chiefly because of its intent to influence conduct?⁵

Then he asks:

To what extent does the Sermon attempt to influence conduct? The conduct of whom is another question of importance. Here the student meets a variety of views.⁶

It is the second of these two questions (i.e., the conduct of whom?) that is the special concern of this paper. Is its primary aim at the conduct of the Millennial citizens? Is it

rather pointed at its original auditors? Does it find its fulfillment in the Great Tribulation? Or is its teaching directed to the disciples in this Church age? The thesis of this paper is that there is a definite and intimate relation between the ethical teachings of Jesus and the present age.

It may be conceded at the outset that this view does not appear to be the most popular in dispensational circles. James Rand, for example, in an article entitled "Problems in Literal Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount," expresses surprise that Bible scholars seem to shrink from the real problems in the Sermon (i.e., those having to do with its literal interpretation with regard to the Millennium). He is disturbed because those who have written exegetical studies of Matthew 5-7 have turned "instead to analyses of the sermon which stress the application of its spiritual principles to believers of this age." He adds:

Such attempts while productive of great spiritual blessing do not meet the problems of the literal interpretation of this portion of God's Word to Israel and the Messianic kingdom. Indeed some decry such as exclusive interpretation, maintaining that it must be applied not only to Israel but also to the church. Even such a one as A. C. Gaebelstein takes such a stand. He assails as a false interpretation "that one, which makes the sermon on the mount exclusively Jewish."⁷

Rand continues:

Such statements are caused by evident confusion in the mind of the writer of the basic hermeneutical difference between interpretation and application. To make application of the words of Scripture is to take the teaching which is developed from a normal, literal interpretation of the words and to derive from this literal interpretation a practical or spiritual application which may be put to use in the life of the interpreter or in the lives of those to whom he will divulge the application he has discovered. To illustrate, consider the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites. The interpretation is that this is a fact of history. An application is that it speaks of our redemption by the power of God. It is axiomatic that there can be only one interpretation but many applications.⁸

But Rand's illustration does not help with the problem at hand for the Sermon on the Mount is not "a fact of history" in the same sense as the crossing of the Red Sea. The Sermon involves teaching which is to be understood and acted upon by men. The interpretation and application of it is much more closely related than in the case of his illustration.

The plan of this paper is to suggest that the ethical teachings of Jesus are for the present age: (1) because they cannot be restricted to the Millennium; (2) because they are not restricted to the days of the "first advent" or to the days of the "great tribulation;" (3) because there are good reasons for holding that such is the case; (4) because they are "supradispensational."

1. THE ETHICAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS ARE FOR THE PRESENT AGE BECAUSE THEY CANNOT BE RESTRICTED TO THE MILLENNIUM.

The most commonly held opinion among dispensationalists is that the people chiefly concerned in the Sermon on the Mount are those who will be the citizens of the future mediatorial kingdom which is to be established in the earth. The clear-cut position may be seen from the following representative statements.

. . . . The Sermon on the Mount has . . . application . . . literally to the kingdom. In this sense it gives the divine constitution for the righteous government of the earth. Whenever the kingdom of heaven is established on earth it will be according to that constitution.⁹

. . . . It was delivered at the time in our Lord's ministry when He was presenting the Kingdom promised of old It is the proclamation of the constitution of that Kingdom, and applies in a particular sense to the government as it will be when Christ returns to reign.¹⁰

The Bible provides three complete and wholly independent rules for human conduct--one for the past age . . . which is known as the Mosaic Law and is crystallized in the Decalogue; one for the future age of the kingdom which is crystallized in the Sermon on the Mount; and one for the present age which appears in the Gospel by John, the Acts, and the Epistles of the New Testament.¹¹

If, then, the Sermon on the Mount be neither the way of life for the sinner, nor the rule of life for the believer, what is it? The answer is that the Sermon on the Mount is the code of laws of the Kingdom of Heaven, which Kingdom, though for the time being rejected and held in abeyance, will one day be set up on this earth In the Sermon on the Mount we have this King, Jehovah-Jesus, formally offering the Kingdom to Israel in His own person. This offer is made in Galilee, for it had been offered through John the Baptist in Judea and rejected. The Anointed King in this great discourse plainly sets forth the nature of the proposed Kingdom and the laws by which He will govern the earth when He re-establishes and occupies the throne of David.¹²

. . . . The Sermon on the Mount is teaching concerning the Kingdom, the magna charta of the Kingdom and all its principles. Such a kingdom in the earth, with subjects who have all the characteristics of the royal requirements laid down in this discourse will yet be. If Israel had accepted the King it would then have come with a righteous nation as a center, but Christendom is not that kingdom. In this wonderful discourse the Lord speaks as the King and as the Lawgiver, who expounds the law which is to rule His Kingdom.¹³

Parenthetically, it should be noted that most of these writers concede that there is a "secondary application" of the Sermon to the church; however, none of them seem to develop this.

The theory that the Sermon represents the "constitution of the future millennial Kingdom" will not stand under examination. In the first place, it lacks proof. It seems to be built chiefly on the circumstantial ground that Jesus was addressing Jews who were anticipating the Kingdom and that this discourse is found in a context which relates the genuine "offer" of the Messianic Kingdom. While this might be sufficient to establish the theory if there were no evidence to the contrary, an examination of the Sermon itself seems sufficient, on internal evidence alone, to show that the theory cannot be true.

The age which is characterized by the content of the Sermon does not fit the concept of righteousness, blessing, and peace which the Scriptures give of the Millennium. As one dispensational writer puts it:

. . . . It is difficult to conceive how the sermon on the mount can be intended to apply to the Millennial earthly Kingdom promised to Israel. Persecution for righteousness' sake is hardly likely to take place then. That will not be a period when men will "reproach" and "persecute" the saints, and say all manner of evil against them falsely for Christ's sake. Nor is it likely that conditions at that time will render necessary the command, "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Nor again can it be imagined that there will be false prophets going about in sheep's clothing, though actually in the character of ravening wolves (Matt. 7:15). Compare, on the other hand, Paul's warning to the elders of the church at Ephesus concerning such men (Acts 28:29). Again, to those who are reproached and persecuted for Christ's sake the Lord promises a "reward in heaven" (5:11, 12). Rewards in heaven do not appertain to Israel's Millennial condition.¹⁴

Another team of dispensational writers, C. F. Hogg and J. B. Watson, summarize the characteristics of the age reflected in the Sermon as follows:

It is sometimes contended that the Sermon on the Mount is to be in force during the Millennial Reign of Christ. But the characteristic of the Millennial Age is that therein righteousness will be maintained by adequate power, whereas today these are in opposite camps. In this age there are two Kingdoms--"the power of darkness" and "the Kingdom of the Son of God's love." In that age there will be but one, for then "the Kingdoms of the world" will have become "the Kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ" (Col. 1:13; Rev. 11:15).

It is right, then, to ask what may be gathered from the Sermon itself as to the character of the age for which it is intended. Let us see.

Evil is dominant--for those addressed are to hunger and thirst after righteousness.

Strife is prevalent--for they are to be peacemakers.

Corruption is widespread--for they are to act as salt for the preservation of society.

Moral darkness covers the people--for they are to be light to the world.

Mammon competes with God for the allegiance of men--for they are warned that it is not possible to serve both.

Theft, adultery and divorce are excused--for they are warned against the thoughts that breed such evils.

Ambition, jealousy and pride rule--for they are told to be poor in spirit.

Hypocrites gain a reputation for holiness, and unrighteousness triumphs--for they may expect to be persecuted for righteousness' sake.

Wrongs are done without hope of redress--for they are to cultivate the spirit of forgiveness.

Christ is hated--for they are persecuted for His sake.

The Devil is free--for they are told to pray that they fall not under his power.

The Lord is absent--for they are fasting.

The "world-rulers of this darkness" are in control; the Kingdom of God is not yet--for they are to pray, "Thy Kingdom come."

They are a people with heavenly hopes--for they are to look for their "reward in heaven."

The age of which the Lord spoke, and the age of His Millennial Reign, could not be set in sharper contrast, nor can we fail to recognize in it the characteristics of our own time.¹⁵

In the light of evidence such as this it is understandable that D. J. Pentecost, of Dallas Seminary, also rejects the millennial application of the Sermon's contents. He writes:

It is our conclusion that the presence of evil and evil men, the existence of poverty, famine, hunger, and need, are all contrary to the predictions made in the Old Testament concerning the character of the kingdom. Unsaved will not enter the millennium to run rampant against the righteous (Jer. 25:31-33; Ezek. 36:22-29; Matt. 25:31-46). We thus conclude that the Sermon on the Mount cannot be made to apply to conditions on the earth after the establishment of the kingdom.¹⁶

The certainty of the millennial-mediatorial kingdom is not dependent upon the "futurity" of the teachings in the Sermon. In fact, it would seem that dispensational lines would be easier to defend, have fewer inconsistencies, and might make more converts if this untenable position would be abandoned.

II. THE ETHICAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS ARE FOR THE PRESENT AGE BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT RESTRICTED TO THE DAYS OF THE FIRST ADVENT OR TO THE DAYS OF THE GREAT TRIBULATION.

Though some dispensational Bible scholars make the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount to be pre-millennial in its contents, some of them still prefer to see no direct application to the present age. While recognizing that they cannot be millennial they are still determined to restrict its application to Israel and Israel's earthly kingdom but classify its contents as "the requirements for entrance into the Kingdom."

Rand, who still holds the "millennial-kingdom-view" of the Sermon, also applies it to the "entrance-requirement" idea. He says:

Not only does the sermon contain rules for living in the kingdom, but also it contains requirements or standards for entrance into the Kingdom....¹⁷

Pentecost seems to give the clearest delineation of this more restricted viewpoint:

While we are in total agreement with the interpretation that the Lord at His first advent offered a kingdom to Israel which they rejected and was consequently postponed, we feel that this Sermon on the Mount is to be connected with the offer of the kingdom rather than with the description of the kingdom or the kingdom age itself.

. . . . Our study has shown us that in its primary interpretation the Sermon on the Mount is directly applicable to those of our Lord's own day who by their profession in John's baptism were anticipating the coming of the King and the kingdom. Since Israel rejected the offered King and His kingdom, the same message will be directly applicable, again, when the same "gospel of the kingdom" is proclaimed once more to herald the approach of the King and His kingdom prior to the second advent.

. . . . it was spoken to those who were anticipating the kingdom to show them that that which Christ offered to them was actually what the Old Testament had promised them, that righteousness was the divine requirement for entrance into the kingdom, not the righteousness of the Pharisees, but the true righteousness according to correct interpretation of the law, and that those who would were invited to enter that kingdom. While presenting a secondary application to us, it is primarily applicable in its interpretation to the nation Israel as they anticipate their King.¹⁸

The answer to this restricted "kingdom-anticipation" view would seem to be at least fourfold. In the first place there is the matter of silence. The Scripture has nothing to say about any such restriction in regard to people or in regard to time; i.e., that the sermon is limited to Israel, on the one hand, or is confined to the period immediately prior to the kingdom's appearance, on the other.

Second, there is the matter of ability. If it is difficult to conceive of these teachings

being fulfilled in the life of a regenerate person empowered by the indwelling Spirit of God, how could the unregenerate Jew ever hope to manifest such righteousness in his own strength in order to qualify for entrance to the Kingdom? And, moreover, how would he accomplish these requirements in a period of time when the Holy Spirit would not be present as He is during this age? This would be sheer legalism or works and could result in nothing but hopelessness and despair on the part of the auditors.

Third, there is the matter of celestial reward. Such a viewpoint still leaves unexplained how the sermon can be restricted to Jews when it speaks of a great "reward in heaven." Most dispensationalists see the promises to Israel as linked to "the Land," in connection with the coming kingdom, and heavenly blessings as accruing to the church.

In the fourth place there is the matter of hiatus. If all this ethical teaching of our Lord is restricted in application to the time of Christ's earthly ministry, or is transferred to the last half of the 70th week of Daniel, it would leave the church without an extensive statement of ethical principles from His lips. In closing this section an appropriate comment from Ironside would seem to be in place:

It is not for us to relegate all this to the Jewish remnant in the last days or to disciples before the cross, though fully applicable to both. But we discern here "wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Tim. 6:3) which we dare not refuse to obey, lest we be proved to be such as are described in the following verse (I Tim. 6:4): "He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings." We need to remember that, though a heavenly people, we have earthly responsibilities, and these are defined for us in this greatest of all sermons having to do with human conduct.¹⁹

III. THE ETHICAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS ARE FOR THE PRESENT AGE BECAUSE THERE ARE POSITIVE REASONS FOR HOLDING THAT SUCH IS THE CASE.

(1) It is the natural way to take the Sermon. This is the obvious inference one receives from the whole tenor of the Lord's teaching throughout the three chapters as well as of His ethical teaching elsewhere. It is also suggested by the way in which He addresses His disciples. On the one hand He is very personal and intimate, addressing with the second person singular; on the other hand He uses the second person plural, and not infrequently He uses the universal "whosoever." But He never restricts His remarks in the Sermon to Israel or the nation of the Jews as such!

(2) The ethics are never formally withdrawn nor is there any suggestion that they should ever be held in abeyance. This is not only true as far as the content of the Sermon on the Mount is concerned, but it is also true for the whole Gospel of Matthew and for ethical teaching throughout the rest of the New Testament.

(3) The example and precept of our Lord furnishes another reason for holding on to His

teaching in this realm. Hogg and Watson have a penetrating observation in this connection.

Towards the close of His ministry the Lord spoke "to the multitudes and to His disciples, saying, The Scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not" (Mt. 23:1-3). It is not conceivable that the Lord should come under His own condemnation! Rather His peculiar glory is this, a glory not shared by any other teacher the world has ever known, that He was Himself the embodiment of the things He taught. In a larger than the immediate sense of the word, the Evangelists record "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach" (Acts 1:1). The order is significant. He lived the Sermon for thirty years before He preached it.

On one occasion when the Jews asked Him, "Who art Thou?" the Lord replied, "Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning." His last words to the world again identify Himself with His teaching, "He that rejecteth Me, and . . . receiveth not My sayings, . . . the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day" (Jn. 8:25; 12:48). The Sermon on the Mount is the Lord's self-portraiture; not of His physical appearance, indeed, but of His character, and, therefore, of the character the attainment of which is to be the ambition of His people. It is what He was, and hence is what we ought to be. The subjects of the Kingdom are to reflect the character of the King.

Long afterwards Peter wrote to persons who had become obedient to the faith in distant lands: "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow His steps" (1 Pet. 2:21). words which may be paraphrased, "setting a copy line for you to follow," since that is the literal meaning of hupogrammatos, which appears here only in the New Testament. Those who enter His Kingdom are to keep to the tracks He made, or, as John expresses it, "to walk even as He walked," and like the Thessalonians, are to become "imitators . . . of the Lord." This pattern, this "copy line", is most clearly discernible in the Sermon on the Mount.²⁰

(4) The Lord's encouragement in the promise of reward and His warnings to heed "these commandments" and "sayings," (especially his warning against breaking the least of them and teaching others to do the same), should give anyone great pause before he presumes to break, or even ignore these words of our Lord.

(5) The language of the great commission. The Lord had given the teachings, injunctions, yes, "commands" of the Sermon on the Mount to the twelve disciples. In the closing verses of Matthew the disciples are commissioned to make other disciples of all nations. They are to baptize these disciples and they are to teach them to observe all the things which Jesus had commanded them.

The responsibility did not stop with evangelization; it included baptism and then continu-

ous instruction in and continuous keeping of all the will of God. (Note present tense of the participle didaskontes and the present tense of the infinitive tērein which underline the prominence and the persistence that this aspect of the commission was to have.) There was to be no "selection" of things to be taught and observed. The "all things" is clear and compulsory. Furthermore, as though He anticipated that some would later seek to explain away the abiding force of His words, He adds a phrase which indicates that the commission in its completeness is to be in force for this entire dispensation: "Lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the age." Now the consummation of the age has not yet taken place and the Lord has plainly indicated that this commission and His presence to help carry it out is in continuous force "all the days" till the present age has run its course.

It should be kept clearly in mind that the incentive for "observing all things whatsoever He has commanded" is not that by doing so one becomes a disciple, or earns salvation, or wins eternal life, for this is the "free gift of God . . . through Jesus Christ our Lord." The motivation force or incentive is the desire (wrought in the Christian by the Holy Spirit) "to walk even as He walked" (I Jn. 2:6), to "walk and to please God" (I Thess. 4:1). This is the test of our love and the condition of His, even as the Lord said, "he that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him (Jn. 14:21)" . . . "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love" (Jn. 15:10). "For this is the love of God," says John, "that we keep His commandments" (I Jn. 5:3).

Hogg and Watson's comment at this point is:

If not in the Sermon on the Mount, and kindred passages, where are these "commandments" to be found? Assuredly not exclusively in the Discourses in the Upper Room. The Gospels must be taken as complementary one of the other. (Important in this connection are the words of Dr. H. C. G. Moule in his book Jesus and the Resurrection, p. 17, "I cannot help seeing . . . the many details in which St. John in his Gospel, takes for granted the main Evangelic narrative, and passingly and without anxiety, uses his readers' knowledge of it." . . .) It would be more than precarious to exclude from the sayings recorded in one Gospel all reference to sayings recorded in another, and impossible to justify attaching a different meaning to the identical phrase "all things" in the two passages, Matt. 28:20 and John 15:15, "ye are My friends if ye do the things which I command you . . . all things that I heard from My Father I have made known unto you," and, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you." The words are the words of the Father, the voice is the voice of the Shepherd; His sheep hear it and they follow Him" (Jn. 10:27).²¹

(6) The practice of the apostolic church indicates that they understood the force of the "great commission" in the manner indicated above. The apostles made and baptized disciples and followed this with the continuous instruction that had been enjoined by the Lord. The new disciples persisted continuously in the teaching of the apostles and thus were keeping all things which Jesus had commanded (cf. Acts 2:41, 42). All this occurred after the birth of the Church and in the age of grace. The Apostle Paul (not one of the twelve), in Acts 20:27, reminded the Ephesian elders that he had not shunned to declare unto them "all the counsel of God."

(7) This attitude carried right on, without a break, into the period of the Ante Nicene Fathers. The view of the earliest Church Fathers, as reflected in their quotations and use of the New Testament, was that the Sermon on the Mount and the ethical teachings of Jesus were to be applied. They did not have to defend such usage. There was no question in their minds but that the words of the Lord were to be received and acted upon. As mentioned earlier in this paper, Matthew was the Gospel most frequently quoted; and the most frequently used part of Matthew was the portion covering what is now called the Sermon on the Mount.

(8) The teaching of Paul gives additional support for applying Jesus' ethical teaching to this present age. The Epistles of Paul with their doctrines (whether theological or practical) in no wise contradict the teachings of the Savior. There is no difference between the soteriology of Paul and Jesus as imagined by the liberals; nor is there a difference in the ethics of either as imagined by some dispensationalists. Paul does not teach a different way of salvation. He does not teach a reduced code of behavior. As a matter of fact, in his last epistle, he calls attention to the inspiration and profitableness of all Scripture for the purpose of furnishing unto all good works (II Tim. 3:16, 17). In Titus 1:1 he calls attention to "the faith of God's elect and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness." In I Tim. 1:4 he would divert his reader from the things which minister questions and center his attention on "godly edifying which is in faith." The most direct passage in which the apostle specifically enjoins adherence to the ethical teachings of our Lord seems to be I Tim. 6:3, 4. "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words. . . ."

That the ethics of Paul are in agreement with the ethics of Jesus may be seen by the fact that almost every admonition of the Sermon on the Mount is repeated in one form or another in the Epistles. (See Hogg and Watson's little book for a chapter devoted to the display of these striking parallels.)

IV. THE ETHICAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS ARE FOR PRESENT AGE BECAUSE THEY ARE SUPRADISPENSATIONAL.

The synoptic gospels record the statement of Jesus that heaven and earth would pass away but that His words would not (ou mē, emphatic double negative) pass away. It would seem that His words rise above dispensational boundaries. He tells men that the words which He spake would form the basis for their judgment. This is true not only with respect to His words about His own person, and His words about prophetic truths; it is also true with regard

to His words about ethics. Saving and moral truths rise above, bridge across and outlast dispensational divisions. This is true of our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. Before the birth of the Church, it was meant for the twelve who heard it during the time when the Kingdom was being proffered; after the day of Pentecost, it was meant for the early Church which received it in the apostolic teaching; and, later, it was still meant for the Church when she obtained it in a permanently recorded form when the inspired Gospel of Matthew was given to her. No doubt the Sermon will have application in the future, after the rapture of the Church, when the saints of the Tribulation period will apply its teaching to themselves.

It may be claimed of the Sermon on the Mount that it is intended for the guidance of regenerate persons in an unregenerate world. And because the gifts and empowerment of the Gospel are his who trusts and serves His Lord, these words of Christ stand. Their revelation has never been withdrawn: they set forth the true standard of Christian morality. They describe the conduct produced by the life of Christ in His believing people: they abide in full moral applicability to us: they are superdispensational and reveal the moral laws upon which the judgments of the Day of Christ are founded. Thus they should be studied and taken to heart by the follower of Christ who would learn of Him who is meek and lowly in heart.²²

DOCUMENTATION

1. Harvey King McArthur, Understanding the Sermon on the Mount (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 105.
2. C. F. H. Henry, Christian Personal Ethics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), p. 278.
3. Henlee Barnette, "The Ethic of the Sermon on the Mount," Review and Expositor, LIII 1 (Jan. '56), p. 24.
4. D. J. Pentecost, "The Purpose of the Sermon on the Mount," Bib. Sac. (Vol. CXV, 1958), p. 128.
5. L. D. Huber, "A Homiletic Study of the Sermon on the Mount, the Ethical Motif in Matthew 5-7," Southwestern Journal of Theology (Vol. V, No. 1, Oct. '62), p. 65.
6. Ibid.
7. James Rand, "Problems in Literal Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount," Bib. Sac. (Vol. CXII, Jan. '55), pp. 28, 29.
8. Ibid.
9. C. I. Scofield, Scofield Reference Bible . . . 1917, pp. 999, 1000.
10. E. Schuyler English, ed., Holy Bible . . . Pilgrim Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 1228.
11. L. S. Chafer, Systematic Theology (Dallas, Texas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948) Vol. V., p. 98.
12. Wm. L. Pettingill, The Gospel of the Kingdom, Simple Studies in Matthew, (Findlay, Ohio: Fundamental Truth Publishers), p. 58.

13. A. C. Gaebelein, The Gospel of Matthew, An Exposition (New York: Our Hope Publication Office, 1910), p. 9.
14. W. E. Vine, The Divine Plan of Missions (London: Pickering & Inglis Ltd.), pp. 105, 106.
15. C. F. Hogg and J. B. Watson, On the Sermon on the Mount (London: Pickering & Inglis Ltd., 3rd printing, 1947), pp. 18, 19.
16. "The Purpose of the Sermon on the Mount," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXV (April, 1958), p. 135.
17. Rand, op. cit., p. 31.
18. Pentecost, op. cit., pp. 133-134, 317-318.
19. H. A. Ironside, Expository Notes on the Gospel of Matthew (New York: Loizeaux Bros., Inc., Bible Truth Depot, 1943), p. 44.
20. Hogg and Watson, op. cit., pp. 12-13.
21. Hogg and Watson, op. cit., pp. 23-24.
22. Hogg and Watson, op. cit., from the jacket of the book.

THE JEW

BRUCE L. BUTTON
Los Angeles, California

Who is a Jew? While this question may seem superfluous at first consideration, it has, nevertheless, posed a question to both Jew and Gentile down through the ages. Once again this question has come into prominence. This time it has been raised in the young nation of Israel as the outgrowth of a request by Oswald Rufeisen, a Polish Jew converted to Catholicism, and now a Carmelite Monk living in Israel. Rufeisen, now Father Daniel, was converted to Catholicism in Poland in 1942. Since 1959 he has been living at the Carmelite Monastery in Haifa. Approximately four years ago he applied for citizenship under Israel's Law of The Return, which, briefly stated, permits any "Jew" to become a citizen of Israel simply upon return to the land, taking up residence in that land, and making application to the Ministry of Interior for citizenship, at the same time offering valid proof of being a "Jew."

Father Daniel is the born son of a Jewish mother. According to Halacha (the legal formulae on which the foundation of Jewish religious life is based), and also according to every other Rabbinical interpretation, a person so born is a Jew, even if he apostatizes to Christianity, Catholicism, or any other religion, or believes in no religion at all. In other words, once a Jew by birth through a Jewish mother, always a Jew. So here is a Polish Jew named Oswald Rufeisen, a man who aided other Jews to evade and escape the clutches of the Gestapo during the horrid years of Nazi domination, asking for citizenship in Israel under the Law of the Return as any Jew would do. True, he has converted to Catholicism; true, he is a Carmelite Monk; true, he has had to seek Vatican permission to change his Polish nationality for Israeli Jewish citizenship; but according to the highest Jewish religious code, he is a Jew! He is entitled to citizenship on the basis of his Jewishness. He enters Israel, takes up residence in Haifa, and submits his application to the Ministry of Interior.

Now he could, under Israeli law, become a citizen in the same manner as a non-Jew. This would entail his living in Israel for a period of time and then becoming a "Naturalized" citizen. But this would not be returning as a Jew under the Law of the Return. Father Daniel desired above everything else to be admitted to Israeli citizenship as a Jew! The Ministry of the Interior rejected his application on the ground he was not a Jew! They were ready to accept his bid to become an Israeli citizen under the Nationality Law (i.e. to become a citizen in the same manner as a non-Jew), but Father Daniel insisted on his Jewishness and brought suit in the courts of the Land. As a result, the case reached the highest court of Israel and four out of five Justices endorsed and upheld the Ministry's and the lower court's ruling, i.e., Rufeisen's application for citizenship under the Law of the Return was to be rejected. The reasoning of the court can be summed up as follows:

This article was one of the Bauman Memorial Lectures for 1963, delivered at Grace Theological Seminary, February 5-8. Mr. Button is Superintendent of the Brethren Messianic Testimony, Los Angeles, California.

Presiding Justice Moshe Silberg maintained that the Law of the Return is one of historical significance, a national law that "must be interpreted in accordance with currently accepted concepts." He also held that the "one common aspect binding all who live in Zion" is "that we cannot cut off our-selves from the historical past and we do not reject our fathers' heritage." "We cannot," he said, "desecrate the name and content of the term Jew." He added, "Accepting a convert as a Jew would mean a distortion of Jewish history. Our new culture in Israel is but a new addition of our past. Whether religious, non-religious or anti-religious, all Jews are bound to the Jewish people's heritage." Justice Silberg held that this rejection could be based on the Law of the Return because it was a secular law. Thus to the question as to whether Rufeisen was considered a Jew, the answer was "No!"

Justice Moshe Landau gave answer to Rufeisen's claim that Israel was not a theocratic state and that the term Jew under the Law of the Return had secular rather than religious undertones. Rufeisen claimed he did not give up Jewish peoplehood, but only Judaism, when he became converted. Justice Landau said if the court accepted Rufeisen's argument that the state is a product of Zionism and that the Zionist rather than the religious criterion must prevail, his (Rufeisen's) appeal must fall because Zionist philosophy is against him on that point. The Justice maintained "one must accept Herzl's viewpoint in rejecting Zionist membership to a converted Jew."

Justice Ekiahu Mani concurred with the majority ruling.

Justice Avi Berinson concurred "most reluctantly" with the majority decision and voted to reject the appeal only on the ground that the Law of the Return, when it contained the rider "unless he has adopted another religion" rejected Rufeisen as a Jew only on a technicality.

Justice Cohn, in his dissenting opinion said the rider to the Naturalization Law was unconstitutional and unsuited to a modern State. Thus Justice Cohn would have granted Rufeisen's request for citizenship as a Jew under the Law of the Return.

Rabbinical circles in this country and elsewhere in the world were quick to point out that Rufeisen could still obtain Israeli citizenship. Rabbi Balfour Brickner, director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregation's Commission on Interfaith Activities, said, "It should be made clear that the decision in no way precludes the possibility of Brother Daniel's becoming an Israeli citizen. It only says that his application for citizenship cannot be based on the fact that he once was, or may still consider himself to be, a Jew. This decision should make abundantly clear that, just as all Israelis are not Jews, so all Jews are not Israelis... To be a Jew, is to be a member of a religious and/or an ethnic group. Only in Israel does the word "Jew" involve nationality."

Thus the state of Israel has rendered its verdict as to what constitutes being Jewish in a manner becoming citizenship. And Oswald Rufeisen, now Father Daniel, a Polish Jew converted to "Catholic Christianity" is not worthy to receive citizenship as a Jew under the Law of the Return. In this sense Israel says he IS. NOT a Jew.

It might be well to point out here that the writer has, as yet, been unable to determine the extent to which the High Court of Israel investigated the Holy Scriptures to ascertain the Almighty's ideas on this subject. Certainly since Israel's claim to the Holy Land is based in part on the promises received by the patriarchs from the God of Heaven, He should have a say in the matter. Should it be maintained that they did consult this authority in that they took Halacha into consideration, the reply can be made that they merely referred to the Rabbinical interpretations of the Holy Scriptures. Since much of Halacha is disregarded in other fields in this day and age (for it, too, is interpreted in accordance with currently accepted concepts, and is, in part, treated as antiquated and useless) it is doubtful if any of its interpretations are valid.

Then, too, the matter of constitutional interpretation does not present a reasonable and solid basis for such findings since this constitution and its interpretation is made in the shadow of the memory of Nazi persecution. And it would be extremely difficult for such to be otherwise. However, the fact that one Justice reluctantly concurred while recognizing the rider ["unless he has adopted another religious belief"] only as a technicality which withholds from Rufeisen the desired citizenship; and another Justice declared outright that the rider is unconstitutional; reveals to the world at large that Jewish thought relative to the Jewish rights of Hebrew Christians are changing. The sad part is the other side of the picture. There is displayed the unwillingness of certain Jewish persons, even those who are skilled and privileged in dispensing justice, to reason logically when the welfare of the Hebrew Christian is involved.

Now as to the question of whether Zionism is the foundation for such findings, here again bigotry plays its part. It is inconceivable that Herzl, the founder of the Zionist movement, could have dispassionately considered the possibility of Jewish people believing in Jesus as the Messiah and still retaining their Jewish ties and background. Herzl, for all his excellent qualities, was still a reactionary product of Gentile hatred and persecutions. He accepted the common Jewish belief that all Gentiles were Christians and all Christians were Gentiles. The sordid crimes of unregenerate men were blamed on the Church. And the fact that the visible, local church, and at times the ecclesiastical rulers of the various churches did participate in Jewish persecution tended to give credence to this belief. Also, European rulers, who encouraged anti-Jewish movements, were professing Christians, and this helped to strengthen the "Gentile is Christian" belief in Herzl's mind. Thus Zionism would be a poor criterion by which to determine the Jewishness of a Hebrew Christian.

Since we are here to discuss, in some measure, "The Jew," and as we would not render an unjust verdict for our consideration, we would do well at the onset of these discussions to define in several areas what we, as Christians, believe God's Holy Scriptures teach relative to the identity of the Jew.

Let us consider the origin of the Jew. We tend to speak of Anti-Semitism when we speak of hatred toward or atrocities committed against the Jewish community. It is true that the Jew is a Semite, a descendant of Shem, the son of Noah (Genesis 11:10-26 and 10:21-24). The word "Semite" is derived from the Hebrew word Shem. But it is also true there is a great number of other people in the world who are Semites, who are not "Jewish" in any respect. They not only are not persecuted as are the Jews, but they have in the past and are now at present taking part in Jewish persecution. Scientifically, the word "Semite" is a technical term

for the Semitic family of languages. From the Biblical standpoint the term "Semite" is also a technical term for the descendants of Shem who settled the territory of Syria, Chaldea, Persia, and Arabia, and later in Palestine. Thus the name "Shem," with reference to Noah, indicates a family of languages and a family of people.

The association given the name "Shem" by Noah, however, points out a far more important truth. When Noah, upon awakening from his alcoholic stupor, pronounced his curse and blessing upon his various sons, he credited to Shem a relationship which was apparently lacking in his other sons. His words, "Blessed be the LORD, the God of Shem" (Genesis 9:26), seem to indicate that Shem desired fellowship with Jehovah. At least the LORD was at this early time recognized as the God of Shem!

Then, too, the simplicity of the name "Shem" which Noah gave to his firstborn son has a far deeper implication than would at first appear. The word "Shem," in its simplest rendition, means "name." It would be, to say the least, a queer name to give one's firstborn unless the word "name" held a far more potent meaning to the one giving it than it does to us. Noah, a preacher of righteousness (2 Peter 2:5) found grace in the eyes of the LORD (Genesis 6:8). When he was commanded to complete the enormous task of building the ark (Genesis 6:12-21), he obeyed the LORD (Genesis 6:22), and as a consequence, he and his loved ones were saved from the wrath of the LORD (Genesis 7 & 8; I Peter 3:20; II Peter 2:5) in the destruction caused by the Flood.

Now constantly throughout Holy Scripture the word "Shem" ("Name") is used with reference to God. "For my name's sake will I defer mine anger," says Jehovah to sinning Israel (Isa. 48:9). Men "call upon the name of the LORD" when they realize they are but mortal (Gen. 4:26). The Psalmist speaks of "those who love thy (Jehovah's) name" (Psalm 5:12).

Moses speaks of a place "where the LORD your God shall cause his name to dwell" (Deut. 12:11). Solomon recalls this to Jehovah in the dedicatory prayer for the temple with the words: "That thine eyes may be open toward this house night and day, even toward the place of which thou hast said, My name shall be there" (I Kings 8:29).

Even David cried out for safety and salvation with the words: "Save me, O God, by thy name" (Psalm 54:1).

In the light of Noah's experience with Jehovah and the manner in which the word Shem ("name") is used throughout the Old Testament, I take it that Noah, in calling his eldest son "Shem" was setting forth a remembrance of all he had received and expected to receive in "The Name" of Jehovah. Thus Noah's son Shem was known as "The Name" and was a constant reminder to Noah and his family of God's grace.

Now this is the line from which the Jew has descended. He is, along with certain other peoples, a remembrance of God's goodness and grace. The fact that the world at large, and even the Jew himself, ignores this truth, does not alter the fact that even in judgment God is good, and is seeking what is best for those who trust Him; protecting, providing, dispensing His grace in all its fullness, that those who trust Him "shall walk, O LORD, in the light of thy countenance. In thy name they shall rejoice all the day: and in thy righteousness shall they be exalted" (Psalm 89:15-16).

Now it would appear that the descendants of such a person as Shem should strive to please and be a praise to "The Name." Such, however, has not been the case. Holy Writ records of Israel:

For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you as it is written. Rom. 2:24 (cf. Isa. 52:5)

Since the creation of Adam and Eve the progress of man has been ever downward. Regardless of what the evolutionist would have us believe, men have not advanced ethically or morally. Ethically and morally the efforts of man have always been in a state of decay and retrogression. As to character, the picture of man has always been bleak. Men have never tried to live up to the standards God set for them. God delineates the cause of this when His prophet declares:

All we like sheep have gone astray; We have turned everyone to his own way. Isa. 53:6.

for men,

Knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only to do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them. Rom. 1:32.

The descendants of Shem, including Israel, are no different. We need but investigate the next step in the line of descent to have proof of this.

Abram, the High Father, or as he was later designated by God, Abraham, father of a multitude of nations, was a descendant of Arpachshad the son of Shem. When we are first introduced to him in Holy Scripture, we find him living with his father, Terah, in Ur of the Chaldees, and native to that land. He was married, childless, and apparently devoid of personal purpose; for when his father, Terah, left Ur, he took Abram with him. The word yikaeh "take" seems to imply taking with the idea of possessing and using for one's self interests (Gen. 8:20, 16:3, et al). This would fall in line with what we know of the family life of that day. Abram seemed content to follow after and submit to the will of his father. Even after his father's death in Haran, it took the spoken direction of the Lord to send Abram on his way to what was then, as far as Abram was concerned, an unknown destination (Gen. 12:1; cf. Heb. 11:8).

Abram gave heed to God's direction. At the age of seventy-five, he departed from Haran (Gen. 12:4).

Now Abraham had a relationship with God which was peculiar and outstanding in the Old Testament. He was called by God, "Abraham, my friend" (Isa. 41:8, 2 Chron. 20:2). The word used to designate this relationship does not come from the Hebrew word re', which means "a companion." Instead, its root is in the word 'dhav, which basically means "to desire" or "to breathe after," and it includes the idea of one who is beloved intimately. Thus, Abraham occupied a special place in the love and affection of God. Apparently he returned this

love and affection. God spoke to him, directed him, protected him, and prospered him. We do not find this particular phrase used by God in connection with any other man in the Old Testament.

You would not expect "the friend of God" to give evidence of any of the weaknesses which beset the average man. However, when we investigate Abram's life, we find that he was beset by the same weaknesses which trouble us all. In Genesis 15 we find Jehovah dealing with Abram in a vision. Abram presented his perplexing problem to the LORD. He had no son who would be his heir. Abram said:

Behold to me thou hast given no seed, and lo,
One born in my house is to be mine heir.
Gen. 15:3

And Jehovah replied to Abram:

This man shall not be thine heir; but he
that shall come forth out of thine own
bowels shall be thine heir.
Gen. 15:4

As Abram was brought forth abroad, Jehovah spoke to him:

Look now toward heaven, and count the Stars,
if thou be able to count them; so shall thy
seed be.
Gen. 15:5

The Scriptures state:

And he believed in the LORD: and He counted
it to him for righteousness.
Gen. 15:6

In other words, in the face of an apparently hopeless situation, upon the assurance of Jehovah, Abram was ready and anxious to trust in His promise even though he was eighty-four or eighty-five years of age and his wife, Sarai, ten years younger. However, in a very short time this strong faith was to be bolstered with human ingenuity. No longer would they wait for the promise of God. They would attempt to accomplish it in their own strength. So Sarai sent her Egyptian hand maid, Hagar, to Abram. She conceived and bore a son who was named Ishmael. For the next fourteen or more years, consternation reigned in the dwelling of Abram as a consequence of this faithlessness.

Abram's faith became steadily weaker and when next the LORD dealt with him on the subject of a son, he gave evidence of the weakness of his faith. Even more important, he gave evidence of why his faith had reached this point. This High Father who was now designated by God as Abraham, Father of a multitude of nations, together with his wife Sarai, who had

now been given the name Sarah, or Princess, by God, revealed their human nature. When the LORD again assured him he would have a son by Sarah, Holy Scripture records:

Abraham fell upon his face and laughed and said in his heart; "shall a child be born unto him that is a hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninety years old, bear?"
Gen. 17:17

And Abraham said unto God: "Oh that Ishmael might live before Thee!"

Human nature always displays itself in two ways: doubt as to the power of God; and desire to fulfill selfish interests. Here is Abraham, the man who "believed in the LORD: and He counted it to him for righteousness;" here is the friend of God, laughing in derision at the promise of THE LORD. "In his heart" is the location of his unbelief. His selfish desire was that Ishmael, the tangible, might live before God. Doubt and selfish desire is what we find in Abraham, the man to whom the Lord had imputed righteousness because of his belief, his faith. The fact that he was a descendant of Shem, "The Name," does not change the matter, for men do not receive the power to become the sons of God because of their blood line. Men do receive from their forefathers the ability to doubt. If Abraham passed on any quality to his descendants, the Jewish people, it is the ability to question and doubt the miraculous power of God. This human degeneration has invaded every field of Jewish life. Today it is expressed most strongly in Jewish skepticism concerning the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus. Thus, while Abraham is classified as "righteous" because he believed in the LORD, his descendants, in going about to establish their own righteousness, display their doubt concerning the miraculous power of God and have not (and seemingly will not) submit themselves to the righteousness of God (Rom. 10:5).

This is not the only area of doubt in Jewish life. There is another area which is displayed in the person of Isaac, the son of Abraham. Isaac, meaning "laughter" in the Hebrew, was ever confronted with his father's and mother's lack of belief in the power of the LORD. His name was a constant reminder of this, for while Sarah said on the occasion of the birth of Isaac ("laughter"):

God hath made laughter for me; everyone that
heareth will laugh on account of me
(Gen. 21:6),

the name is more than just the commemoration of joy at the birth of a son. It is also a reminder of Abraham's and Sarah's lack of faith in the power of the LORD to accomplish that which was humanly impossible. I would imagine that Isaac never heard his name without being reminded of his parents' deficiency and also of the faithfulness of the LORD to effect that which He has promised.

There was an incident in the life of Isaac which should have had the effect of strengthening this faith in the power of the LORD to protect, for it was in this area that Isaac principally doubted. The incident was the offering of Isaac on the altar by Abraham on the Mount in the

land of Moriah. It was here that Isaac knew by actual experience the protection of THE LORD. To all intents and purposes he was as good as dead until the ram was provided as his substitute. The knowledge of his parents' failure to keep strong faith in the LORD, together with this experience as a reprieved altar sacrifice, should have served as a foundation for Isaac's complete and unwavering faith in the ability of this God of Power to provide protection for those who trust Him. However, the actual story of Isaac's faith is quite different.

In the twenty-sixth chapter of Genesis, Jehovah appeared unto Isaac and ordered him to remain in the land of Gerar:

Sojourn in this land and I will be with thee
and will bless thee.
Gen. 26:3

The Jehovah recounted the blessings and the reasons for them. Immediately thereafter we read:

And Isaac dwelt in Gerar. And the men of the
place asked him of his wife; and he said: "She
is my sister"; for he feared to say: "My wife,"
lest the men of the place should kill me for
Rebekah, because she is fair to look upon.
Gen. 26:7

Here is Isaac, a man who knew the power of God to protect, resorting to the lie that he might escape a supposed danger. God had but recently spoken to him, assuring him of blessings and protection. But in the face of uncertainty, Isaac was a son of his father; he displayed his human nature; he disregarded his faith in Jehovah; he resorted to human means to relieve his anxiety. In so doing, he created a situation in which a heathen king, upon ascertaining that Rebekah was Isaac's wife and not his sister, said:

What is this thou has done unto us? Thou wouldst
have brought guiltiness upon us.
Gen. 26:10

You see, God's protection was there all the time. Even in the society of this heathen land, the sacredness of the marriage relationship was established. Abimelech was, in a sense, God's means of protection, for he charged all the people saying:

He that touches this man or his wife shall
surely be put to death.
Gen. 26:11

The only danger existing for Isaac was in his mind. This doubting human nature caused Isaac to scorn the protection of the LORD. This same nature exists in Isaac's descendants today. God maintains:

For whosoever shall call upon the name of the
 Lord (Messiah Jesus) shall be saved.
 Rom. 10:11

Protection is involved in this word "saved." And yet, today, most Jewish people will not even consider the possibility of the Messiahship of Jesus and the protection one finds in Him, not only from God's wrath but also from the world. No Isaac that ever lived can claim to be a son of God because of the will of the flesh. How truly Isaiah speaks when he says:

I have spread out my hands all the day unto
 a rebellious people that walk in a way that
 is not good, after their own thoughts.
 Isa. 65:2

It is man's own thoughts which cause him his greatest difficulties. Man never seems to learn that he does not think along the same lines as God, nor does he accomplish things in the same manner in which God wants them accomplished. (Isa. 55:8). Man, humanly speaking, intensely desires independence. He even strives to be independent of God. He is not willing to wait for God to accomplish His purpose in his life. He must effect it himself. He must be independent!"

Jacob, the son of Isaac, was another such man. Without a doubt he knew that Jehovah had said of him:

The elder (Esau) shall serve the younger (Jacob).
 Gen. 25:23

He knew it was the purpose of Jehovah that he should have the birthright and blessing of the first-born. He knew this and yet he schemed to avail himself of the family birthright, and later connived with Rebekah, his mother, to gain for himself the patriarchal blessing of Isaac. Nor could Jacob excuse himself with the thought that Esau despised his birthright. The problem still remained in the stolen blessing which Esau did not despise. Jacob gained that which was to be his, but the manner of his gaining it was absolutely wrong. This was the reason for Esau's hatred and his threat to kill Jacob. This was the reason why Jacob had to flee to Haran and tarry with Laban until Esau's anger cooled.

Jacob's character was still the same while he was in Haran. There was disagreement between Jacob and his father-in-law, Laban, who was of similar character. It resulted in Jacob's leaving Haran and returning to the homeland of his father. But there was still the old problem of Esau and he had to deal with it. He began to deal with it in the same old human way. He still failed to take into consideration God's purpose for his life. True, at the start of his trip, he prayed to God. He asked God for deliverance from the hand of Esau and he reminded God of His promise:

And Thou saidst: I will surely do thee good,
 and make thy seed as the sand of the sea,
 which cannot be numbered for multitude.
 Gen. 32:13

But he immediately split his people into two camps, and proceeded to send bribe after bribe to Esau.

I will appease him with the present that goeth
before me, . . . peradventure he will accept me.
Gen. 32:22

But he does this in the face of the express command of God:

Return unto thy country, and to thy kindred,
and I will deal well with thee.
Gen. 32:9

"I will deal well with thee" should have implied to the mind of Jacob that God would fulfill his purpose in Jacob's life. Jacob, for all his religiousness, failed to understand God and went about to accomplish the reconciliation with Esau in his own strength. He was conscious of his own character. He was a supplanter. He knew to what he would respond. Therefore, he knew that Esau would respond to the same things in the same way. Thus Jacob exercised the will of man; he resolved to accomplish this reconciliation through human effort. And so the bribes were sent forth and Jacob tarried that night at the ford of Jabbok. He had sent all of his company and possessions across the stream. God's Word says:

And Jacob was left alone.
Gen. 32:25

It is at such a time that God is best able to deal with a man. God chose this time to deal with Jacob. The outcome was that Jacob realized he needed, above everything else, that which only God could supply. Jacob needed a change of character.

"What is thy name?" asked God.

"Supplanter," confessed Jacob.

With that conscious admission from Jacob, God said:

Thy name shall be called no more Jacob but
Israel, for as a prince thou has power with
God and with men.
Gen. 32:28

Now Jacob was a new man. He was Israel, a prince with God. He acted as such. He assumed his place of responsibility; he headed the procession as it went toward the land of his nativity and Esau.

And he himself passed over before them, and
bowed himself to the ground seven times until

he came near his brother. And Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, fell on his neck, and kissed him; and they wept.
Gen. 33:3-4

Jacob did not, Jacob could not, have effected this reconciliation through human wisdom. Upon his submission to God, God was able to accomplish His purpose, first in the life of Jacob and then in this reconciliation.

This is where our Jewish friends fall short today. For the most part they deny the power of God. The Old Testament, states Kaplan, "is a source of perplexity to vast numbers of intelligent Jews who cannot reconcile the belief that the miraculous events recorded in the Bible actually happened with what reason and present knowledge of cultural evolution testify concerning all such tradition."¹

Our Jewish friends fall short in the matter of the protection of God. Time after time, as I have ministered to Jewish people, they have made this statement: "Six million Jews were killed in our lifetime. If there is a God, why did He not protect our people?"

Again they fall short in the matter of the purpose of God. Security in the world, in their thinking, is not based so much upon the purpose of God but upon man's purpose. It is not being born from above that changes a man. It is an evolutionary process. To quote Kaplan again:

Not only has man achieved greater control over formerly hostile forces in nature, but little by little he is learning the need of world-wide human cooperation to achieve a satisfactory and secure life.²

Who is a Jew? This is not a superfluous question. A Jew is one who has descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. A Jew has also received something else from these old patriarchs. He has received a nature which is ready to doubt God's power, God's protection, and God's purpose for his life. Only through a salvation experience can a Jew really become a prince of God. He must realize and accept the truth which the Jew Johannon preached.

But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.
John 1:12, 13

And it is up to us who believe as John believed to witness to them,

That through your mercy they may also obtain mercy.
Rom. 11:31

DOCUMENTATION

1. M. M. Kaplan, Judaism Without Supernaturalism, page 9.
2. Ibid., p. 114.

"TO THIS AGREE THE WORDS OF THE PROPHETS"

A Critical Monograph on Acts 15:14-17

Abridged by the Author

CHARLES ZIMMERMAN

Winona Lake, Indiana

"Simeon hath declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name, And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." (Acts 15:14-17)

The significance of this passage lies in the use of Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messianic kingdom by the Apostles of the early Church. Its dispensational implications have been under debate for some time and from many quarters. This can be made clear by citing two contrasting statements. Scofield writes, "Dispensationally, this is the most important passage in the New Testament."¹ On the other hand, Bruce argues that the passage "has been given an exaggerated 'dispensational' significance far beyond the implications of the text."² Without doubt there is an interpretation which would be most harmonious with the total context of Holy Scripture and would be acceptable to a serious student of the Word.

At the outset it should be recalled that Christianity was an outgrowth or development of the true, genuine Hebrew religion. Christ himself was a Hebrew after the flesh. His ministry was exercised among Hebrews. Following Pentecost the Church growth had been almost exclusively Hebrew. There may have been exceptions as scattered disciples preached Christ here and there and Gentiles heard and believed. However, the general movement was Hebrew. Therefore, the Church experienced a violent perturbation upon the admission of Cornelius, a Gentile, as recorded in Acts 10. This was only the beginning of a threatening, long-continued controversy. The problem was doomed to come to a head in the not-too-distant future.

The crisis occurred upon the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch from their first missionary journey. They found that certain men had come down from Judea and were insisting that circumcision and submission to the Mosaic law were necessary for salvation.

The danger of this course was clear. The fundamental principle of the Gospel, salvation by grace through faith, was at stake. The practical question of fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians also lay in the balance.

Paul and Barnabas were appointed to go up to Jerusalem and discuss the problem with the apostles and elders. The church assembled and the discussion followed. There were three notable addresses upon that occasion.

Peter was the first to speak. Without arguing doctrine, he just stated the facts and the deduction. He reminded the company that ten years before he had been led by God to the house of Cornelius. The members of that household, though being Gentiles, heard the Gospel and believed. The deduction was then made clear. If God accepted these Gentiles and cleansed their hearts by the Holy Spirit, why should further conditions now be imposed on them which God Himself plainly did not require.

During the silence which followed, Barnabas and Paul presented more supporting evidence for Peter's argument. Their recent missionary journey through Cyprus and Asia Minor revealed the mind of God in the bestowal of blessings upon the Gentiles.

At this point, all eyes were turned upon James, the brother of our Lord. As a leader among the elders of the Jerusalem church, he enjoyed the respect and confidence of all. He referred to Peter's speech. Summarizing it, he said, "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." This fact is said to be in perfect harmony with the words of the prophets.

Now it is generally accepted that the prophecy to which Peter was referring is found in Amos 9:11,12. According to the best authorities the prophecy was given approximately eight centuries before its use in Acts 15.³ Among the prophecies of Amos, it comes at the conclusion of an elaborate pronouncement of woes and judgments upon the Northern Kingdom of Israel and, generally, upon the whole "house of Jacob." As the tone of the prophecy changes, the prophet reveals that the fallen fortunes of the royal house of David will be restored and it will rule over all the territory which had been included in David's empire. Here is a clear reference to the Messianic reign.

This exposes the real crux of the problem. How could James quote an Old Testament prophecy concerning the future Messianic Kingdom as support for certain happenings in the church? In what sense do these "words of the prophet" agree with the "taking out" of the Gentiles?

FULFILMENT IN THE CHURCH?

Those who hold this view believe that the words of the prophet found their complete Messianic fulfilment in the reception of the Gentiles into the Church and Christianity. This was done for the first time at the house of Cornelius in Caesarea by the virtue of what had happened on the day of Pentecost. God took a people from the Gentile world. This is understood to be the mystery, "That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel" (Eph. 3:6).⁴

This view finds its basis in an eschatological framework which assumes that the Old Testament prophecies about the coming kingdom are fulfilled in the Church. This framework may consist of either the total spiritualizing method of the amillennialists or the semi-spiritualizing method of the post-millennialists. Therefore, all support for this view will be conditioned by this method of interpretation.

At the very outset in James' use of the prophecy, a variation from the Hebrew text occurs. It is felt that "after these things" in the Greek New Testament and "in that day" in the Hebrew text are used synonymously and interpretatively. Lenski argues,

Amos writes, "in that day" i.e., when Israel's punishment will have been inflicted, in the day when the Messianic Kingdom will be founded, in the day of the Christian Church. When James spoke, that day had come and hence he quotes interpretively when he substitutes the phrase, "after these things," namely the inflictions of which Amos had spoken.⁵

The verb, "I will return," was inserted by James and does not appear in the Hebrew text. Barnes explains what he feels is meant by it when he says,

When the people of God are subjected to calamities and trials, it is often represented as if God had departed from them. His returning is an image of their restoration to his favor and to prosperity.⁶

It is felt that the building again of David's tabernacle does not refer to the house of David or David's descendants, even as a royal line. "But in Jesus, risen and glorified, the throne and the Kingdom or rule of David were raised up and established forever."⁷ The tabernacle stood for the Church. The Church of Israel had fallen into a desperate state, because its parts were ruined. James was saying that God would restore it.

It is further supposed that James was most concerned with the words "all the Gentiles." The great Messianic restoration was intended most particularly for the Gentiles.⁸ Their coming into it made David's tabernacle (the Church) greater than ever.

The pronounced spiritualizing method used by the adherents of this view is noted for its absence of "controls" in interpretation. That is, there are no consistent literal and grammatical bounds within which they must operate. Its attraction lies in its flexibility. However, if words do not mean what they say within the bounds of common sense interpretation, then the reader has nothing to guide him in his understanding. He is in imminent peril of going astray theologically at any point. Typical dangers will be pointed out in refuting this view.

First, the proponents assume that which must be proved when asserting that "in that day" of the Hebrew text is synonymous with the day of the Christian church. This conclusion is based only upon the assumption that the Church is the recipient of all Messianic Kingdom blessings.

Second, the words of the Lord, "I will return," are made to be only an image which refers to restoration of favor. However, the language plainly implies a personal appearance! The prophet's emphasis on restoration is not neglected by James. This may be noted in the verbs that he used, "I will build again" and "I will set it up." It didn't just happen that James adds this idea to the prophecy given by Amos. Could it be possible that this phrase "I will return" was inserted as an accommodation to the particular situation at hand as the result of a New

Testament enlightened understanding to indicate that the restoration would come to pass upon the Lord's literal return to reign?

Third, confusion arises in identifying the "tabernacle of David" with the Church. To follow through with such a hazardous method of interpretation would make the words of our Lord meaningless when He said, "I will build my Church" (Matt. 16:18). There is no indication that this had been in process during the past centuries through Israel. The church was a new concept. Walvoord comments on this matter relative to the passage at hand. He says,

By no possible stretch of the plain meaning of the passage can the tabernacle of David be made to be an equivalent of the New Testament Church. The prophecy concerns the rebuilding of that which was fallen down. The "ruins" are to be rebuilt "as in the day of old." The nature of the blessings are earthly, territorial, and national, and have nothing to do with a spiritual church to which none of these blessings has been promised.⁹

Fourth, only through manipulation of the Scripture can it be said that the great Messianic restoration was intended most particularly for the Gentiles. The very opposite is true. Israel is to be the main recipient of Messianic restoration. "He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth" (Isa. 11:12). "He that scattered Israel will regather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock" Jer. 31:10). The regathering as well as the scattering is applied to Israel.

It should be said that by far the majority of expositors consulted by the writer adhere to this view. However, in all fairness to many early expositors (before the twentieth century) whose writings seem to classify them with this view, the writer wishes to absolve them from any theological stigma. They were writing before many of the fine lines of eschatological distinctions had been drawn. Therefore, many of their statements are broad and general because no issue had demanded a neat definition. What they did not say should never be made to reflect upon their basic theological position.

FULFILMENT IN PRINCIPLE?

The exponents of this view suggest that the words of the prophet were fulfilled in principle at the time of the conversion of Gentiles. Perfect fulfilment will occur in the future Messianic Kingdom.

The writer is not unaware of the limitations of language in naming this view. To say that an application of a principle in a given prophecy is a fulfilment of that prophecy is to speak somewhat meaninglessly. However, warrant for such usage is given by Terry in stating,

When a given passage is of such a character as to be susceptible of application to other circumstances or subjects than those to which it first applied, such secondary application should not be denied the name of a fulfilment.¹⁰

It is suggested that James refers to the facts related by Peter. He shows how those facts were in perfect harmony or agreement (not literal fulfilment) with the words of the prophet. The blessings of Gentiles as Gentiles had been announced by God long before. Amos is quoted as proof that there would be Gentiles upon whom God's name would be called. Therefore, there should be nothing inconsistent with Gentile conversion.

James is not understood to say that the perfect fulfilment of this was now taking place, or that the tabernacle of David was now being raised up. One of the proponents of this view says,

It is sufficient for him that such a thing as Gentiles being owned as God's was in full accord with God's ways announced. The prophecy clearly looks on to millennial times, and not to Christian; but that which God can do at one time cannot be in itself inconsistent for Him to do at another.¹¹

This view clearly recognizes a literal, future Messianic reign of Christ on earth. It also ably handles the word "agrees." This is an extremely unusual word for an introductory formula of a prophetic quotation. In this case it is merely suggesting an agreement of a principle; namely, the inclusion of Gentiles as God's people.

However, one question must be answered if this view is to be accepted. Why did James change the words of the prophet, "in that day," to "after these things?" If there was no immediate contextual time element involved and if the fulfilment of the prophecy was yet future, why change the words given by the prophet. It was not necessary for the prophet to say, "after these things" to indicate that the blessings were to follow the judgments. This is clear even upon a cursory reading of the passage. The time element was merely stated as "in that day." Since "that day" was still future for James, it would seem unlikely that he would change the phrase unless he had some further content of revelation to unfold.

It may also be asked how the argument of this view bears upon the basic problem at the Jerusalem council. The problem did not revolve around the matter of Gentile inclusion as a principle. This was foretold over and over in the Old Testament (Isaiah 2:2; 11:10; 60:5; 66:23). It was a matter of common knowledge. The heart of the question involved the imposition of certain Jewish requirements upon Gentiles as necessary for salvation in the existing Christian economy. For lack of development and explanation, the strength of this view is weakened.

MULTIPLE FULFILMENT?

The proponents of this view hold that the words of the prophets began to be fulfilled at the time when God called out for Himself a people from among the Gentiles and will be completed in fulfilment in the future Messianic Kingdom. This view is based upon a hermeneutical principle suggested by Ramm that "there is in prophecy primary and ultimate reference, i.e., the possibility of successive fulfilment."¹² Terry as well makes room for such a possibility. A prophecy may not be the prediction of a specific event, "but a general oracle of God, and of such a nature as to be capable of repeated fulfilments."¹³ Kent understands certain prophetic fulfilments recorded by Matthew in his gospel to be of this nature.¹⁴

It is the contention of this view, "that God had at this time begun to choose for himself a new people who were to bear His name, a people from among the Gentiles."¹⁵ However, this was only the beginning. In the same sense, the subsequent conversion of every Gentile who believes, provides the occasion of further or multiple fulfilments. Completion of the fulfilment will occur in the Messianic Kingdom upon the restoration of the Jews and the inclusion of all the Gentiles upon whom the name of God is called.

Bruce holds to some variation of this view. He agrees concerning the complete fulfilment of the prophecy. He writes, "the primary sense of the Massoretic Text is that the fallen fortunes of the royal house of David will be restored and it will rule over all the territory which had been included in David's empire."¹⁶ His deviation comes in explaining how James uses the prophecy.

James' application of the prophecy finds the fulfilment of its first part (rebuilding of the tabernacle of David) in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, the Son of David, ...and the fulfilment of the second part in the presence of believing Gentiles as well as believing Jews in the Church.¹⁷

If it is assumed that "agreement of the words of the prophets" means the same as "fulfilment of the words of the prophets," which may be a dangerous position, then the writer understands how Bruce is crowded into his explanation. The proponents say that multiple fulfilments of the last part of the prophecy occur as believing Gentiles are called God's people. But James did not quote the last part only. He also spoke concerning the tabernacle of David. How was this being fulfilled? Bruce suggests it was being fulfilled in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. This conclusion involves a spiritualizing method akin to that used by the first view considered.

Therefore, the writer has some problems with Bruce's explanation. By what method of hermeneutical manipulation can the "tabernacle of David" refer to David's empire and rule (i.e. the Son of David) and, almost in the same breath, refer to the resurrection and exaltation of Christ? Also, it seems strange that the apostles or Christ himself never referred to this text when they appealed to the Old Testament for attestation of the resurrection of Jesus. Rather, they appealed over and over again to the Psalms (comp. Psa. 16:10 with Acts 2:25-31, Psa. 2:7 with Acts 13:33-37, Psa. 118:19-26 with Matt. 21:9, 42). Could it be that the apostles saw nothing of Christ's resurrection in the prophecy of Amos concerning the building again of the tabernacle of David?

If the holders of this view suggest that the first part of the prophecy quoted from Amos was not relevant to that time, but rather to a later time (which some seem to imply by their silence), then it may be asked, Why did James include it in the quotation? Why did he not also include some of the judgments which precede this passage in Amos? The judgments seem to have reference to the same group of people as the blessing.

How does the prophecy concerning "all the Gentiles" agree with what Peter had just said? Peter's words were not nearly so inclusive. He only said that God visited the Gentiles to take "out of them" (not "all of them") a people for His name. The writer does not wish to appear pedantic, but when it is said in Scripture that a certain thing is being fulfilled, who has the

authority to suggest that part of it is and part of it isn't being fulfilled? This is the position and dilemma into which one is forced if this view is accepted.

The writer is ready to concede that part of the prophecy is of such a nature as to lend itself to multiple fulfillments. The inclusion of Gentiles may be the common element in fulfillments which occur at different times. However, James does not just quote that part which pertains to Gentiles. There is also the subject of the "tabernacle of David." Though a prophecy may be capable of successive fulfillments, it does not seem likely that when a fulfillment is stated as such it is intended to be accomplished in stages.

FULFILMENT IN SEQUENCE

Those who hold this view believe that the words of the prophets are not yet fulfilled but will be fulfilled in the future Messianic Kingdom. They are used here to unfold the sequence of the future program of God for men.

There is to be a taking out of Gentiles into the church according to the present economy. "After these things" the Lord will return and build again the Davidic dynasty. The prophecy will be fulfilled in a proper time sequence; namely, in the future Messianic kingdom. Chafer suggests that, "the elders of the early Church distinguished here between the Church as a present Divine objective and the final return to, and completion of, the Davidic covenant."¹⁸ The harmony and agreement of the words of the prophet with Peter's statements consisted in this, "that there was no conflict when all Scripture was properly referred."¹⁹ When the sequence of events in God's program for the ages was recognized, there would be no problem of establishing right policies for the Gentiles at that time or in the future.

The writer has accepted this view as being the most nearly correct interpretation. It seems to present the fewest problems and follows the most consistent literal, historical and grammatical system of interpretation. The strength of this view will be better understood by means of the following development.

First of all, it must be established that this passage has the Church in view as distinct from the Messianic kingdom. Historically it may be observed that the emphasis upon the Kingdom in the early chapters of Acts helps to explain the Jewish-Gentile problem in the Apostolic church. Running parallel with the movement of the Kingdom in Acts there was also the history of the Church which began at Pentecost. McClain points out that,

Because of the reoffer of the Kingdom to Israel, the period begins with the Kingdom in the forefront. And while the prophets had made clear that the Gentile nations were to share in its benefits, the nation of Israel always held the place of priority. Therefore, it becomes understandable that the admission of Gentiles to the ekklesia raised the problem of how they were to be received, if at all.²⁰

The adjustment of the church was being accomplished by the growth of Jewish opposition to the offer of the Messianic kingdom and by the process of new revelation concerning the unique nature of the Church begun on the day of Pentecost. The words of James at the Jerusalem Council were a part of the latter process. Chafer says, "The early (Jewish) Church is

discovering the new divine purpose and recognizing that postponement of the earthly Kingdom."²¹

It seems that as late as the third chapter of Acts there was a genuine offer of the Kingdom to a repentant Israel. However, upon their rejection of the Kingdom and intensified opposition against those who believed and announced that Christ was the Messiah of Israel, there was a shift in preaching emphasis from the Kingdom as an imminent possibility contingent on Israel's repentance, to the Church as a unique body of believers in which all racial and national distinctions disappear.

By the time of the passage under study, this shift was perhaps most pronounced in the message of Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, who had just returned from a prosperous missionary journey. No doubt the emphasis in his oral ministry was similar to that of his written epistles. It was made perfectly clear. Christ "hath made both (Jew and Gentile) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition...for to make in Himself of twain one new man" (Eph. 2:14, 15). This change in emphasis indicates a transition in the Divine economy relative to Israel. The Church as a unique body was being unveiled having a glory all its own.

The reaction of the Jewish leaders to the message that Jesus Christ is the true Messiah of Israel is certainly not in harmony with the Old Testament revelation concerning the Messianic Kingdom and its establishment. Rather than opposition to the Messiah, there is every indication that Israel will be characterized by repentance in that day. "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son" (Zech. 12:10). This period recorded in the Acts of the Apostles must be, without question, distinct from the Messianic Kingdom.

Peter's address at the Jerusalem Council also indicates a distinction. Peter, in relating how the Gentiles believed and received the Holy Spirit, stated that God, "put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts 15:9). This is the church economy as indicated in Eph. 2. Paul made it even more plain when he said, "For there is no difference between the Jew and Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him" (Rom. 10:12).

However, the Scriptures make it quite plain that in this Messianic Kingdom there will be some distinction between Jews and Gentiles. The prophet Isaiah sees Israel as the economic, social and religious leader among nations in the Messianic Kingdom. Nations will be owned of the Lord as "nations that are called by my name" (Amos 9:12), but Israel "shall be named the Priest of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves" (Is. 61:6). It would seem that the Gentiles will be the literal servants of Israel in that day. "And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers" (Is. 61:5). At that time there will be a difference between Jew and Gentile; therefore, Peter must have had reference to something other than the Messianic Kingdom.

The doctrines relative to the Church and the Messianic Kingdom are clearly established in this passage. Amos introduces his prophecy with the time element, "in that day." This phrase has undoubted reference to the "day of the Lord." In Amos 5:18, 20, it is specifically

called the "day of the Lord." It is common to almost all the Old Testament prophets.

McClain describes this as "a period which is always associated with the Kingdom of Old Testament prophecy."²³ It seems to be a period of intense judgment followed by immense blessing for Israel. The latter will be initiated upon the return of the King. At this time, God will raise up the "tabernacle of David." There is little question but that this refers to the "Davidic throne." However, it should be understood that the New Testament nowhere equates the throne of the Father with the throne of David. Christ is seated "on the right hand of the Majesty on high," (Heb. 1:3) but this is not at all the same as being seated on the throne of David.

The establishment of David's throne will secure Israel's supremacy over the nations, will be a time of material prosperity, and will guarantee their permanence in the land. Israel is the center of all events.

This could never be identified with the New Testament Church. It concerns a rebuilding of that which had fallen down. The ruins will be set up again "as in the days of old" (Amos 9:11). As Walvoord says, "The nature of the blessings are earthly, territorial, and national, and have nothing to do with the spiritual Church to which none of these blessings have been promised,"²⁴

It is worthy of note that this distinction needed to be taught to the disciples as late as Acts 15. Throughout the ministry of Christ they were encouraged to expect a literal fulfillment of the Kingdom promises. They had been promised thrones upon which they would judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28). Sufferings in this life were to be rewarded by eating at the King's table (Luke 22:30). In Acts 1:6 they were still looking for a literal Kingdom. While Christ did not reveal the exact "time" for its establishment, neither did He spiritualize it and transfer all their hopes to the Church.

Though the Kingdom was postponed, the promises continued undimmed. Christ would yet return and reign upon the earth. Therefore, a spiritualizing of the Old Testament prophecy, either completely or partially, does violence to the text and to the particular doctrines which are involved.

Therefore, this view most nearly agrees with the total Biblical revelation concerning the Church and Messianic Kingdom. Amos and Peter were talking about two different things.

Secondly, the context of the passage provides a clue as to the relevancy of the prophecy quoted by James to the immediate problem in the Church. There has been considerable confusion on this point. Gerstner suggests the difficulty by saying,

Peter and James also testified that God was actually saving the Gentiles without circumcision and had predicted that in the last days He would restore the residue of men (vv. 15-17). It is difficult to see what bearing that verse had on the precise point of the controversy, which was not whether Gentiles would be saved, but whether they would be saved without the Jewish rites.²⁵

Those who hold to the "fulfilment in principle" view readily solve the difficulty by indicating that the prophecy is quoted to convince them that the principle of Gentile conversion was in keeping with the facts which Peter declared. But the men of old knew very well that the Gentiles should be saved, and the prophets clearly predicted the fact. Therefore, this was not the crux of the problem.

If it be suggested that the Church as a unique entity is under consideration with the principle of Gentiles being included on the same basis as Jews, it should be stated that the prophets did not know of the birth of the Church in which Gentiles were "fellowheirs and of the same body" (Eph. 3:6). This conception was first given to Paul by revelation and now was "made manifest...by the Scriptures of the (New Testament) prophets" (Rom. 16:26). Since the Old Testament did not contemplate this new body, how could quotations from that source be found to bear on it?

Others have more rightly pointed out that the real problem which demanded a church council was whether Gentiles could be saved without performing certain Jewish rites. This seems to be most plausible.

However, some have come to some strained conclusions. Maclaren feels that the argument of silence is the force of James' quotation of the prophecy. He writes,

Now the force of this quotation lies, as it seems,...in the argumentum a silentio, since the prophet says nothing about ritual or the like but declares that moral and spiritual qualifications--are all that are needed to make Gentiles God's people. Just because there is nothing in the prophecy about observing Jewish ceremonies, and something about longing and faith, James thinks that these are the essentials, and that the others may be dropped by the Church, as God had dropped them in the case of Cornelius, and as Amos had dropped them in his vision of the future Kingdom.²⁶

This idea seems to fit the context and would perhaps be acceptable if there was no better solution. It should be said that the argument from silence is, of its very nature, weak. Coupled with this weakness is a lack of purpose for James to alter the original prophecy and say, "after these things." If he was saying that the silence on circumcision in Messianic Kingdom prophecy was the ground for omitting circumcision in the Church, then why did he not use the words of the prophecy, "in that day"? Evidently he was trying to indicate sequence of some nature or another.

Therefore, the writer believes that the "fulfilment in sequence view" most completely fits the context. James was not quoting the prophecy as being directly relevant to the present. He was outlining the course of events as they were developing and would continue to develop. Hence, the force of the question lies in its enlightening the listeners as to God's plan. Peter had declared one thing. God was taking out Gentiles and putting them on the same level as the Jews. He put "no difference between" them (Acts 15:9). This was not out of harmony with those things which would follow according to Amos.

When everything is put in its rightful place and order, there will be no problem with circumcision and other ordinances. God will reveal the necessary requisites for each period

in the proper place and time. Walvoord asserts, "The passage, instead of identifying God's purpose for the Church and for the nation of Israel, established a specific time order."²⁷

Thirdly, a proper exegesis of the passage lends force to this view. James said that Peter had "declared" that God had first visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name in the house of Cornelius. The word translated "declare" means literally to "lead out." It is the verbal root of the noun from which we get the English word "exegesis." Of the six times it is used in the New Testament, five times it is translated "declared." In this sense it may mean only a recounting of certain facts (Acts 10:8, 15:12), or it may suggest an unfolding of hidden truths. Moulton and Milligan agree concerning this latter usage in that numerous examples of the technical use of this verb "denotes the communication of divine and other secrets."²⁸ According to Thayer it is "used in Greek writings of the interpretation of things sacred and divine, oracles, dreams, etc."²⁹

John uses it in this way when he says that, "no man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son...He hath declared Him" (John 1:18). He means that the Son revealed, exegeted, or interpreted the Father to men as none other could do or had done. It is in this same sense that James uses the word. He does not mean that Peter was merely recounting his experience at the house of Cornelius, but he was unfolding truths which had been hidden to former generations. Peter had announced how God had saved the Gentiles and put no difference between them and the Jews. Though this had not been made known to men in other ages (Eph. 3:5), now it was declared. Since it had formerly been hidden, how could the Old Testament prophecy be appealed to for support? The declaration of Peter was one thing. What the prophet had to say was another. Therefore, the harmony between the two had to do with something other than content. Historical sequence is being emphasized.

The word translated "agree" means literally "to be in harmony or accord with." It is never used in the New Testament as an introductory formula for an Old Testament quotation or prophetic fulfilment. Therefore, because of the absence of such usage, the passage must make it very plain that a fulfilment is intended. In this case, such clear evidence is wanting.

The sequence of events is expressed in the phrase, "after these things." These were not the prophet's words. Amos wrote, "In that day..." Obviously James was not attempting a literal quotation of the prophet. He rather sought to adapt the prophecy to the situation at hand. Actually, he was indicating that which was to precede the events about which the prophet spoke. That which was to precede is marked out in v. 14 by the word "first." This word in the original language is used over and over in the New Testament to indicate that which is first in a series of events. In listing some of the gifts, Paul wrote, "And God hath set some in the church, first (in a series) apostles, secondarily prophets, ..." (I Cor. 12:28). James says that the wisdom which is from above "is first (in a series of listed characteristics) pure, then peaceable, gentle, ..." (James 3:17). In the passage under study James says that Peter has revealed how God first (in a series of events) visited the Gentiles with salvation by grace through faith plus nothing, and next or "after this" the Lord will return and build again the tabernacle of David.

It should be further pointed out in opposition to the first view listed that the prophecy has not yet been fulfilled as indicated by the phrase, "I will return." This was not a part of the

prophecy but was added by James in the future tense to indicate that what the prophet had said was still future. The spiritualizing method which suggests that "His returning is an image of their (God's people) restoration to His favor and to prosperity"³⁰ must be rejected. No Scriptural support can be given for this view. Walvoord is right when he says,

Israel's blessing will not come until "I return," apparently a reference to the second coming of Christ. That it could not refer either to the incarnation or to the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost is evident in that neither is a "return."³¹

Therefore, one is shut up to a definite time order. First, the inclusion of the Gentiles in God's plan for the Church, and after this the return of Christ to set up His Kingdom.

SUMMARY AND PARAPHRASE

In summary, James makes reference to Peter's declaration concerning God's first taking out of the Gentiles a people for His name. This primarily involved His plan of including both Jew and Gentile in the New Testament Church. To this, James says, the words of the prophets concerning the Messianic Kingdom agree. The time order of the events are in perfect harmony. After this period of Gentile conversion, the Lord will return and will rebuild the tabernacle of David and establish His reign in the promised Messianic Kingdom. During this time Israel shall enjoy their promised blessings and the residue of men (identified as "all the Gentiles") shall seek after the Lord.

A legitimate paraphrase may read as follows: "Simeon has declared (led out in the full meaning of) how God first visited the Gentiles to take out from among them a people for (to bear) His name. And to this visitation of the Gentiles the words of the prophets agree with respect to the order of events in God's plan, as it is written, After these things pertaining to Gentile conversion under grace, I will return (in glory) and I will build again the tabernacle and throne of David which is fallen and I will build again the ruins of it and I will set it up again in the land of its former domain. That the remainder of men might seek the Lord; namely, all the Gentiles upon whom my name has been called, saith the Lord, who is doing these things" (Acts 15:14-17).

DOCUMENTATION

1. C.I. Scofield, Scofield Reference Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), p. 1169.
2. F. F. Bruce, The New Bible Commentary, ed. F. Davidson (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 920.
3. John C. Whitcomb, chart on Old Testament Kings and Prophets (Winona Lake, Ind.: Grace Theological Seminary, 1959).
4. John Bird Sumner, A Practical Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1837), p. 15.
5. R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1944), p. 609.
6. Albert Barnes, Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), p. 230.
7. Lenski, op. cit., p. 609.

8. Ibid., p. 610.
9. John F. Walvoord, The Millennial Kingdom (Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Company, 1959), p. 205.
10. Milton S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1890), II, p. 402.
11. F. W. Grant, The Numerical Bible (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, n.d.), p. 100.
12. Bernard Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1950), p. 160.
13. Terry, op. cit., p. 401.
14. Homer A. Kent, Jr., "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament" (Unpublished Graduate Seminar Paper at Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Ind., 1962), p. 8.
15. Bernhard Weiss, A Commentary on the New Testament (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1906), II, p. 530.
16. F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960), p. 310.
17. Ibid., p. 310.
18. Lewis Sperry Chafer, Systematic Theology (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), V, p. 329.
19. J. M. Stifler, An Introduction to the Study of the Acts of the Apostles (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1892), p. 141.
20. Alva J. McClain, The Greatness of the Kingdom (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), V., p. 428.
21. Chafer, op. cit., p. 268.
22. McClain, op. cit., p. 428.
23. Ibid., p. 178.
24. Walvoord, op. cit., p. 205.
25. John H. Gerstner, The Biblical Expositor, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Co., 1960), III, p. 210.
26. Alexander Maclaren, Exposition of Holy Scripture, Acts of the Apostles (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), p. 86.
27. Walvoord, op. cit., p. 206.
28. James Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), p. 223.
29. Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: American Book Co., 1889), p. 223.
30. Albert Barnes, Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), p. 230.
31. Walvoord, op. cit., p. 206.

BOOK REVIEWS

ANOTHER LOOK AT SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM. By Norman F. Douty. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1962. 224 pp. \$3.50.

Since September, 1956, when Dr. Donald G. Barnhouse published an article in Eternity magazine challenging the evangelical world to accept the SDA movement as basically evangelical ("Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?"), there has been increasing debate on this subject. With the encouragement of Barnhouse, SDA leaders published in 1957 a 700-page volume entitled, Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine, in which they sought to present their movement as one in basic harmony with all orthodox Christian groups. An associate of Barnhouse, Walter R. Martin, likewise sought to present SDAs as evangelicals in his book, The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism (Zondervan, 1960).

In the present volume, Norman Douty, a former president of Grand Rapids Baptist Theological Seminary and College, makes a thorough study of twelve SDA doctrines in the light of their recent claims in Questions on Doctrine and in the light of Scripture. With regard to the former, he succeeds in showing that it does not give a true picture of SDA teaching. With regard to the latter, Douty concludes that the movement is characterized by delusion and heresy. "As long as Adventism remains Adventism it must be repudiated. When it abandons its distinctive doctrines it will no longer be Adventism" (p. 189). Concerning Mrs. Ellen G. White, who founded the movement about 120 years ago with her claims of divine inspiration, Douty states: "We cannot avoid the conclusion that Mrs. White was Satanically ensnared and that those who follow her, however sincere and upright, are equally so" (p. 174).

After studying this book, the reviewer cannot avoid the conclusion that anyone who insists

on classifying SDA as an evangelical movement is either ignorant of its teachings or is confused in his understanding of the term "evangelical." Christians must beware of the current trend of watering down this term to include only an irreducible minimum of orthodox doctrine, and must not fear to brand as heretical those who deviate in significant areas from the plain teachings of the Word of God.

Bible believers everywhere owe a debt of gratitude to Norman Douty for the immense amount of research he has brought to bear upon his analysis of Seventh-day Adventism. While his book is not written in a smooth-flowing and popular style, it nevertheless serves as an indispensable source book for students and Christian workers who are concerned about the true nature of this growing cult.

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.
Grace Theological Seminary

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES (NEW CLARENDON BIBLE). By. C. K. Barrett. Oxford University Press, London, 1963. 151 pp., \$2.50.

This attractive little volume is specifically designed for the college student. The New Clarendon Bible series of commentaries will fill in the gaps in the old series (Clarendon Bible) and also will eventually replace many of the existing volumes of its predecessor. This is the first commentary, to the knowledge of this reviewer, which uses the text of the New English Bible. There are eight illustrations, some taken from ancient sculptures, which assist the reader to visualize the Greek and Roman world. A helpful map of the eastern Mediterranean has been placed on the inside cover.

Less pleasing to this reviewer are some of the author's conclusions. Paul's authorship is

denied, although no one else is suggested (p. 18). Dr. Barrett relies heavily on Harrison's well-known statistics to show the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles (p. 5). However, studies by Hendrikson (Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles, 1957), Guthrie (The Pastoral Epistles, 1957), and Metzger (Expository Times, 1958-59), have shown these statistics to be based on too limited a body of literature to be of any real significance.

To the author's objection that "the picture of Timothy and Titus given in the Pastorals scarcely corresponds with that which is given by Acts and the genuine epistles" (p. 9), this reviewer feels that the problem is more imagined than real. The author insists that the fatherly and elementary advice given in 2 Timothy is incompatible with the information in Acts that Timothy was one of the earliest of Paul's companions. An understanding of the nature of Paul's relationship to his younger associates would seem sufficient to account for such paternal notices.

Although many of the author's insights are stimulating and helpful, the liberal standpoint which often injects itself into the interpretation will greatly limit the usefulness of this volume among the readers of Grace Journal.

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Grace Theological Seminary

TRIUMPHANT IN TROUBLE. By Paul S. Rees. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, New Jersey, 1962. 144 pp., \$3.00.

This little book of studies in I Peter by the well-known preacher and vice president of World Vision, Inc., is an excellent popular treatment of the Epistle. The book is attractively outlined, abounding with pertinent illustrations, and gives evidence of having been preached by this prominent pulpiter.

The volume opens with a chapter on introductory matters, and though it is brief, it provides a fine summary for the student and the serious lay reader. Included are discussions of authorship, original readers, date, and distinctive features. The author decides that Peter wrote to a mixture of Jews and Gentiles, with the latter in the majority. He cites 1 Pet. 2:10, "Once you were no people, but now you are God's people," as arguing for Gentile readership (p. 11). The fact that this passage is a quotation of Hos. 1:9, 2:23, which obviously refers to Jews, would seem to prove the opposite, but this is not discussed by the author.

Dr. Rees does not go into the intricacies of exegesis, but he excels in summarizing the tenor of the passage and in drawing pertinent applications. His treatment of the section on husbands and wives is well done (pp. 70-76). Regarding Peter's passage on slavery, he writes: "No New Testament writer, and not least Peter, makes any attack on the institution of human slavery. Nor does any writer incite the Christian slaves to mount an offensive against it. (Meanwhile, of course, the formidable mountain was being drilled and packed with it, and one day the explosion would be touched off.) It is neither as social philosopher nor as social reformer that Peter is here speaking. The issue to which he addresses himself is this: Within the realities of the existing social situation how ought Christian slaves to deport themselves in relation to their masters?" (p. 61)

On disputed passages, the author apparently takes the view that "Babylon" means Rome (p. 23). He explains the "spirits in prison" as the fallen angels of Genesis 6, to whom Christ made a proclamation of victory during the interval between his death and resurrection (p. 90). The persecutions envisioned in the Epistle are not seen as limited to official and organized trials, but can refer to every kind of opposition (p. 13).

This is a good book. One can be edified by reading it.

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Grace Theological Seminary

THE LAST JUDGMENT. By James P. Martin. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 214 pages, \$4.00.

Here is a penetrating examination of the Last Judgment in relation to the changing moods of Protestant Theology. Commencing with the Orthodoxy of the Reformation Dr. Martin carries the investigation through Later Orthodoxy, Puritanism, Pietism, Rationalism, Idealism, Dispensationalism, and concludes with the theology of Ritschl. With keen insight, he displays how theological systems undermine the Scriptures in such a way that Biblical teaching on eschatology and the Last Judgment is removed entirely from the area of serious consideration or reduced to a meaningless discussion.

Dr. Martin approaches this study with a definite theological system of his own. To him, Orthodoxy possessed the clearest, and the most highly developed system of theology, bringing the Last Judgment and justification into close harmony. In treating the eschatology of the nineteenth century, dispensationalism is summarily dismissed with such statements: "In this system the Last Judgment is merely one feature among many to be looked for, but has nothing to do with history as a meaningful whole... This method leads to an understanding of history as a disconnected system of judgments and human failures... It does not relate judgment effectively to soteriology, and as far as the present age is concerned, it does not feel the need of a Christocentric interpretation of judgment" (p. 191).

History, doctrine, exegesis, theology, philosophy and morality are packed into this

discussion of the Last Judgment. One thing might be hoped for: a presentation of a stream of theology apart from formal treatise that gives the Last Judgment its rightful place. However, every sentence is saturated with meaning, making this a classic in its field.

HERMAN A. HOYT
Grace Theological Seminary

CULTS AND ISMS: TWENTY ALTERNATES TO EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY. By Russell P. Spittler. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1962. 143 pp. \$2.95.

This work is exactly what its title suggests. It presents in concise, readable fashion the essential material relating to the major and a number of minor cults and isms which are at variance with the orthodox viewpoint. The author does not encumber his chapters (13 of them) with unimportant details but immediately comes to grips with what needs to be known about the particular heresy being discussed.

After an introductory chapter, Mr. Spittler devotes chapters II through VIII to dealing with the major cults of the day--Mormonism, Seventh-Day Adventism, Spiritualism, Christian Science, Jehovah's Witnesses, Unity and Moral Re-Armament. In chapter IX he takes up three cults which have come "out of the East"--Theosophy, Baha'ism, Zen Buddhism. Chapter X deals with such minor cults as Anglo-Israelism, Astrology, Father Divineism, Rosicrucianism and Swedenborgianism. Chapter XI is devoted to Roman Catholicism, while chapter XII deals with the general subject of Modernism and related movements such as Humanism, Unitarianism and Universalism, Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy.

In a very helpful closing chapter (XIII) the author interprets the isms showing the lessons that may be learned from them, the general nature of their errors, the sinister character of

their beliefs, and the importance for the Christian to know well his own position before he attempts to deal with those caught in the toils of the various isms.

A splendid chart giving a digest of each cult dealt with in the book appears just inside the front and back covers.

This reviewer has been very favorably impressed with this work and feels that it will make a good textbook for classes dealing with the false cults of the day.

HOMER A. KENT, SR.
Grace Theological Seminary

THE HOME FRONT OF JEWISH MISSIONS. By Albert Juisjen. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1962. 222 pp. \$3.95.

The Home Front of Jewish Missions is a comprehensive study of the responsibility which rests upon the church in its local congregational organizations in the attempt to reach the Jew with the message of Salvation. Mr. Huisjen is a man well suited to the task of producing this book having labored in Jewish missions since February 1, 1924.

The material in the book is presented in five sections. The first is scriptural instruction and admonition that Gentile Christians should show compassion to the Jews, pray for their salvation, and labor in the gospel in their behalf.

The second section delineates how and why the Jew has made the Word of God of non-effect through his vain tradition. Even though this has resulted in a darkened spiritual perception we are assured scripturally the Jew can be moved, he can be reached for the Lord, by those who are really interested.

The third section is a brief history of the unscriptural and unwise approaches made to

the Jew by the Church down through the ages. The reason for the resultant failure to reach the Jew is also clearly presented.

The fourth and fifth sections of the book deal with the problem of reaching the Jew in our day. Here are discussed the "Mission Societies" and their efforts. But more important the Church is challenged to participate in the evangelization of Jews not only through aiding the Mission attempts, but also by an all out effort of its own to reach the Jews in the surrounding community. The book closes with a course of action which can be put to effective use by any interested congregation.

The Home Front of Jewish Missions is a book which has long been needed. I have but two comments to make in closing. The first... "I wish I had said that." The second... A pastor's library is not complete without this volume.

BRUCE L. BUTTON
Los Angeles, California

TWENTIETH-CENTURY RELIGIOUS THOUGHT
By John Macquarrie. Harper & Row, New York, 1963. 415 p., \$5.00.

According to Professor Macquarrie, "Four years ago some members of the editorial staff of Messrs. Harper and Brothers suggested to me over lunch I should write the story of religious thought in the present century, with special reference to the relations of philosophy and theology." The fruit of the luncheon date is the book Twentieth-Century Religious Thought.

The author taught systematic theology at Glasgow University. His current faculty position is in the same area at Union Theological Seminary (New York), with emphasis on liberal religious philosophy.

Surveying religious philosophies of 1900-1960, Macquarrie's book is a quick reference to the divergent schools of religious thought of the period and the chief exponents of the views. The author covers 19 major philosophies (divided into 64 subthemes). The writings of 164 historians, philosophers, scientists and theologians are examined. Chapter XXIII consists of the author's concluding comments. These deserve attention as they reflect the twentieth century religious thought of Union Theological Seminary.

The technical handling of the subject does not recommend Twentieth-Century Religious Thought to many laymen. Seminary students and teachers will find the book helpful for writing theses. Pastors with scholastic background may find Macquarrie's surveys helpful as a summary of the liberal religious views of 1900-1960. If the material in the book is insufficient, a 23-page bibliography of selected writings by the philosophers treated by the author will lead the reader to an abundance of collateral reading.

Macquarrie has selected many lesser writers as well as the outstanding ones (like Josiah Royce, John Richardson Illingworth, William Ernest Hocking, Adolf von Harnack, James Henry Leuba, Sigmund Freud, Carl Gustav Jung, Wilhelm Dilthey, Arnold Joseph Toynbee, Albert Schweitzer, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, Solomon Washington Glasden, Walter Rauschenbusch, Henri Louis Bergson, Alfred Firmin Loisy, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Dewey, Martin Buber, George Santayana, Albert Einstein, Ernest William Barnes, Fulton John Sheen, Karl Barth, Heinrich Emil Brunner, Oscar Cullman, Reinhold Niebuhr, Jean Paul Sartre and Paul Johannes Tillich). One wonders if the lavish number of writers covered by Macquarrie is more a status symbol of his scholarship than an absolute need to understanding the basic essentials of twentieth century liberal religious thought.

In the final chapter of his book, Macquarrie says: "At the end of our survey, the reader may well feel somewhat bewildered. We have met so many views of religion, some of them sharply conflicting others shading off into each other, and some of them so diverse that they may seem to be talking about quite different things or at any rate different aspects of the same thing..."

"On the other hand, we can hardly fail to have been impressed by the extraordinary ingenuity and power of thought shown by the philosophers, theologians, and others included in the survey. The conflict of views is not a sheer chaos..." The genuine Christian reader cannot read Twentieth-Century Religious Thought without realizing that the principles that the book surveys are philosophies "after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Only in Christ "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Macquarrie's concluding comments include these: "Absolute and final truth on the questions of religion is just unattainable." And "One can be loyally and wholeheartedly committed to a religious attitude without believing that it embodies final and exclusive truth, and without abandoning the expectation of learning more." What Macquarrie sets forth as commitment is an ambiguous something incompatible with the words of Jesus:

"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 14:6)

"I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." (John 10:9)

BENJAMIN A. HAMILTON
Grace Theological Seminary

THE MAKING OF A MAN OF GOD. By Alan Redpath. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1962, 256 pp., \$3.50.

Dr. Alan Redpath, formerly pastor of Moody Memorial Church, has produced another refreshing and interesting character study. This work on the life of David is fashioned not as an exegetical or critical study, but is given with a devotional and informative purpose. While no author could cover the life of David in one volume, Dr. Redpath utilizes his twenty-seven chapters well. He generally avoids repetitious thoughts (an easy pitfall in the Davidic studies), often presents the plan of salvation, and regularly challenges the believer to make a lasting response for Christ.

As the life of David is unfolded, he makes a fine integration of appropriate Psalms. The author proposes the question, What timber would God use to make a "man of God"? God seeks a heart which responds to His love and makes a recognition of the power and presence of the Holy Spirit in his life. The conversion of a soul is a miracle of the moment, but the manufacture of a saint is the task of a lifetime.

Chapters Two and Four concerning David's conflict with Goliath and Jonathan's love for David are full of blessings for the reader. Making application for the day, the author strikes at the modern church as correct in organization and ready in techniques, but powerless in battle. He also points out that there is a real price to pay for Christian leadership.

Not all readers will agree with the following conclusions of Dr. Redpath: (1) David's trouble with Bathsheba started with his rejection by Michal (p. 163). (2) Ahithophel was the grandfather of Bathsheba and sought by traitorous action to gain vengeance on David (pp. 207, 223). (3) The Moabites murdered David's parents during their exile in Moab (pp. 178, 179). (4) Christ cannot come today because He must await the evangelization of the whole world (pp. 224-229). Nevertheless, ministers, Sunday School teachers, and the general readers will find here a fresh approach and new applications to the life of David.

JAMES H. GABHART

Waterloo, Iowa

BOOKS RECEIVED

- SALVATION. By Ernest F. Kevan. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 130 pp., \$2.50.
- THE HOLY SPIRIT. By Wick Broomall. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 211 pp., \$2.95.
- WRESTLERS WITH GOD: Prayers of the Old Testament. By Clarence Edward Macartney. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 207 pp., \$2.95.
- PROCLAIMING THE NEW TESTAMENT: THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By John R. Richardson and Knox Chamblin. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 166 pp., \$2.95.
- PROCLAIMING THE NEW TESTAMENT: THE BOOK OF REVELATION. By Merrill C. Tenney. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 116 pp., \$2.75.
- THE CHRISTIAN AND THE COUCH. By Donald F. Tweedie, Jr. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 240 pp., \$3.95.
- RAS SHAMRA AND THE BIBLE. By Charles F. Pfeiffer. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 73 pp., \$1.50, paper.
- THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. By Charles F. Pfeiffer. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962. 119 pp., \$2.50.
- STEPS TO THE SERMON. By H. C. Brown, Jr., H. Gordon Clinard and Jesse J. Northcutt. Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1963. 202 pp., \$4.50.
- TWENTIETH CENTURY CHRISTIANITY. By Stephen Neills, ed. Doubleday and Co., Garden City, N. Y., 1963. 432 pp., \$1.45, paper.
- THE AUTHORITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES. By H. N. Ridderbos. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1963. 93 pp., \$2.50, paper.
- THE SUPREME COURT AND PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL. By J. Marcellus Kik. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1963. 40 pp., \$.75, paper.
- KARL BARTH'S THEOLOGICAL METHOD. By Gordon H. Clark. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1963. 229 pp., \$5.00.
- THE SECULAR MEANING OF THE GOSPEL. By Paul M. Van Buren. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 205 pp., \$4.95.
- COMMUNISM AND THE THEOLOGIANS. By Charles C. West. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 399 pp., \$1.95, paper.
- MIRACLES: A Preliminary Study. By C. S. Lewis. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 192 pp., \$.95, paper.
- YOUR GROWING CHILD AND RELIGION. By R. S. Lee. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 224 pp., \$1.45, paper.
- SEXUAL ETHICS. By Sherwin Bailey. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 169 pp., \$1.45, paper.
- NAUGHT FOR YOUR COMFORT. By Trevor Huddleston. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1963. 168 pp., \$1.45, paper.
- FOUR PROPHETS: A Modern Translation from the Hebrew. By J. B. Phillips. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. 161 pp., \$3.95.
- A SHORT HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE. By Robert M. Grant. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. 224 pp., \$1.45, paper.
- SOCIOLOGY LOOKS AT RELIGION. J. Milton Yinger. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. 192 pp., \$1.45, paper.
- 1200 NOTES, QUOTES AND ANECDOTES. By A. Naismith. Moody Press, Chicago, 1962. 237 pp., \$3.95.

- CAN I TRUST MY BIBLE? By Eight Evangelical Scholars. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 190 pp., \$3.50.
- THE GRACE OF GOD. By Charles C. Ryrie. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 126 pp., \$2.50.
- LET EUROPE HEAR. By Robert P. Evans. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 528 pp., \$5.95.
- THE SOUL WINNER. By Charles Haddon Spurgeon. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1963. 319 pp., \$1.75, paper.
- A DISTINCTIVE TRANSLATION OF GENESIS. By J. Wash Watts. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1963. 154 pp., \$1.95, paper.
- ISRAEL AND THE NATIONS. By F. F. Bruce. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1963. 254 pp., \$3.95.
- HANDBOOK OF BIBLE HISTORY, Book III, THE GOSPELS. By George Stob. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 178 pp., paper.
- THE GOSPEL MIRACLES, and MANY THINGS IN PARABLES. By Ronald S. Wallace. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 218 & 161 pp., \$1.95, paper.
- THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD. By W. H. Griffith Thomas. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 303 pp., \$1.95, paper.
- TREATY OF THE GREAT KING: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy. By Meredith G. Kline. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 149 pp., \$3.50.
- THE NEW TESTAMENT, AN EXPANDED TRANSLATION. By Kenneth S. Wuest. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 624 pp., \$2.95, paper.
- MAN IN GOD'S WORLD. By Helmut Thielicke. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 223 pp., \$3.95.
- TWENTIETH CENTURY RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By John Macquarrie. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 415 pp., \$5.00.
- MATTER AND SPIRIT. By R. C. Zaehner. Harper and Row, New York, 1963. 210 pp., \$4.50.
- CALVIN. By Francois Wendel, and trans. by Philip Mairet. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 383 pp., \$6.00.
- GUILT GRACE AND GRATITUDE. By Donald J. Bruggink. The Half Moon Press, New York, 1963. 226 pp., \$3.50.
- GREEK-ENGLISH ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE OF THE GREEK-ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT. Compiled by J. Stegenga. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 832 pp., \$14.95.
- A SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, Vol. II. By J. Oliver Buswell. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 600 pp., \$6.95.
- THE NEW BIBLE SURVEY. By J. Lawrence Eason. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 554 pp., \$6.95.
- ZECHARIAH. By Merrill F. Unger. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 275 pp., \$6.95.
- NONE OF THESE DISEASES. By S. I. McMillen. Fleming H. Revell Company, Westwood, N. J., 1963. 158 pp., \$2.95.
- NEUROTICS IN THE CHURCH. By Robert James St. Clair. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1963. 251 pp., \$4.50.
- THINGS MOST SURELY BELIEVED. Ed. by Clarence S. Roddy. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1963. 191 pp., \$3.95.
- THE BOOKS AND THE PARCHMENTS, Revised. By F. F. Bruce. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1963. 287 pp., \$4.00.

